

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1876.

The Week.

THE President's message has not added fuel to the prevailing excitement. It is a short, matter-of-fact document, beginning with a naïve confession of his utter lack of training for civil administration (by way of apology for the blunders of the past eight years), and ending with a curious vindication of his Santo Domingo policy. The other topics touched upon are: the reduction of the national debt; the Indian policy—in which the extraordinary statement is made, we believe for the first time, that an effort to remove the miners from the Black Hills could only have resulted "in the desertion of the bulk of the troops" sent there for that purpose; our foreign relations, which are all in a good way, the extradition treaty with Great Britain being reserved for a special message; naturalization, and the claims to protection abroad growing out of it; the admission of Colorado; the condition of the military and naval and postal service; the Agricultural Department; the International Exhibition; and the electoral system. Under this last head the President contents himself with calling attention to the urgent need of new and greater safeguards, and adds that "the compulsory support of the free schools and the disfranchisement of all who cannot read and write the English language after a fixed probation" would meet his hearty approval.

The meeting of Congress was unattended with any special "sensation" or even interest. The Senate began proceedings with the discussion of a resolution introduced by Senator Edmunds ordering an enquiry into the recent Southern elections, while, in the House, committees were appointed for the same purpose. Mr. Randall, on taking the chair, made a short speech, which it is amusing to see causes much grief among the sounder Republicans on account of his taking occasion to remind the House that they must resist at all hazards any encroachments of the Executive. This is so eminently a proper thing for the Speaker of the House to do that it would do no sort of harm if every session of Congress were opened with precisely the speech that Mr. Randall made on Monday. It would serve to remind people of what they seem always inclined to forget, that the House is, in a free government like ours, the representative of the people as opposed to the close corporation which manages the Senate, and the Executive, which has been regarded for several hundred years by every free English and American community as likely to make continual encroachments upon popular rights. For the presiding officer of this body to remind it from time to time of the necessity of a vigilant attitude with regard to the Executive is not only no indication of an improper spirit, it is a proof that he knows what he is about, and for anybody to find fault with him at the present time for such a thing, when the President has just been committing impeachable offences, is simply an indication of crass ignorance as to the history of the country and the nature of free institutions.

Mr. Randall was elected Speaker of the House after a short canvass, conducted without spirit, in which Mr. Sayler of Ohio, Mr. Morrison of Illinois, and Mr. Cox of this State were his competitors. There were objections to Mr. Morrison on the score of physical unfitness for a position which requires the muscles of a horse and the lungs of a bull; and against Mr. Cox, on the score of a general flightiness of mind and levity of character. Against Mr. Sayler we do not know that there were any objections; he distinguished himself last winter as Speaker *pro tem.*, and received at the time the praises of both parties. As to Mr. Randall, it is only fair to say that he is as eminently adapted to the work which he will have to do this winter as he was eminently unfitted for that of the

Speaker of the last session. Last year, when the Democratic House assembled, the matters before the country which needed settlement or intelligent discussion with a view to improvement were the currency, the tariff, and the general management of the revenue, and for these purposes it was important that a Speaker should be selected whose appointment of committees should be fair, and the rectitude of whose decisions on all points of parliamentary law and procedure would command the confidence not only of his party but of the country. Mr. Kerr was, after an excited canvass, selected, and, as the result proved, a better selection could not have been made. His principal opponent was Mr. Randall, who was defeated because, 1st, he had been a "salary-grabber"; 2d, because he was a protectionist; 3d, because he was an inflationist; and, 4th, because he had the open and undisguised support of every corrupt ring or suspected association of jobbers at Washington.

For these reasons, as the Republican papers now justly remind each other, he was rejected and Mr. Kerr was elected. Now, however, the work before Congress is of a very different kind from that which fell to the lot of Mr. Kerr, and it needs a different man. Congress will sit from now till the 4th of March, and the session will end with the inauguration of a new President. The Democrats honestly believe that Hayes has not been elected; that Tilden has been elected; that if neither has been elected the election ought, under the Constitution, to be thrown into the House; and that the Republicans in the Senate and in conduct of the Administration are preparing to cheat them out of this fairly won victory. They therefore feel that the most important thing for them is to select some man as Speaker who will see that, in the first place, they are not cheated, and, in the second, that every advantage which they can possibly get over their opponents is obtained and secured. They have therefore taken their most able man, a skilled parliamentarian and a bitter partisan; a man who, if his reputation does not belie him, will give his party the benefit of every doubt, and will, if he can, see that his party has the best of the approaching contest. Mr. Randall stands among the Democrats, except that his integrity has never been impeached, in very much the position that Mr. Blaine does among the Republicans, and his selection furnishes one more proof that the Speaker has ceased to be a judicial parliamentary arbitrator between the two parties, and has become a sort of Boss who runs the machine in the interest of his own side.

The Springfield *Republican*, in some excellent remarks on the silly talk of a good many people before election as to the dreadful consequences of Tilden's success, mentions Secretary Morrill's going down to Wall Street "to make a foolish and wanton attack on the public credit which he had sworn to defend," and says, "there is some probability that he will be called to account for his words," but it "should not apprehend that any legal penalty can be affixed to them." We trust there is no doubt that he will be called to account for them. If such a disgraceful breach of a high official trust is not a misdemeanor punishable with fine and imprisonment it ought to be. We trust Congress will take sharp notice of it. We will add, what everybody must see, that some very peremptory legislation is needed to remind men high in office that they are servants of the country and not of the party. The conduct of Chandler and Taft during the late campaign ought, as well as Morrill's, to be made illegal. Fifteen years of great majorities, and of loose and reckless modes of doing business bred by the war, have begot a spirit of lawlessness in high official circles which ought to be stamped out at once. Apropos of this, district-attorneys and collectors who publish for electioneering purposes during a canvass that they have discovered frauds on the revenue by one of the candidates, ought to be compelled to follow them up and account for the money they say has been stolen or concealed. The high revenue

official, for instance, who told Blaine, for use on the stump, that Tilden's withheld income-tax amounted on good proof to \$250,000, ought to be compelled to sue for it. Congress ought to examine Blaine as to where he got his information, and see that his informant does his duty.

We have discussed elsewhere the President's use of the troops in South Carolina. During the week the order under which the troops acted, and General Ruger's report in explanation of his course, have appeared. The President, in his letter to the Secretary of War, says: "The Government had been called on to aid, with the military and naval forces of the United States, to maintain Republican government in the State against resistance too formidable to be overcome by the State authorities," and he directs "the Secretary to sustain Governor Chamberlain in his authority against domestic violence." Secretary Cameron, in transmitting the order to General Ruger, bids him "advise with the Governor and dispose his troops in such manner as may be deemed best to carry out the spirit of the above order of the President." It will be observed that the President does not say by whom the Government had been called on for the aid of the army and navy. General Ruger, in his report, says "that on the application of the Governor, and his own belief of the necessity therefor for the preservation of the peace, he placed troops in the State-House, but not in the rooms of assembly of either of the Houses on the day of meeting." His explanation of the use of the soldiers as doorkeepers is that "it came about under the following circumstances"—viz., that "a person at the door of the House, and who claimed authority to examine the certificates of those claiming to be members prior to their admission to the hall, but who he (General Ruger) thought had no legal authority for so doing, applied to the officer in command for the troops."

Now, in the foregoing statement it is to be observed that the occurrences of two years ago in Louisiana showed the necessity of minute instructions to the commanding officer as to his duty, if called upon to preserve order at the organization of a State legislature, and that no such instructions were given him, and in fact no instructions at all, except "to carry out the spirit" of a loosely-written letter of the President: that not only was he not directed to wait for signs of "resistance too formidable to be overcome" by the State authorities, but was directed "to advise with Governor Chamberlain," himself a candidate for office whose success depended on the composition of the Legislature about to assemble; that at the simple request of this gentleman, and before seeing any indication of trouble or disorder, he occupied the State capitol with a military force; that having done so, he left his subordinate officer in such ignorance of his duties that on the application of "a person," one Dennis, the United States Marshal, a disreputable carpet-bagger, and one of the South Carolina Ring, who, General Ruger acknowledges, had no authority whatever in the premises, he detailed a corporal of the guard to pass upon the right of members to enter the House, and this functionary actually for some time examined their certificates, and decided on their validity. During all this it does not appear that Governor Chamberlain made any attempt whatever to police the State-House or its vicinity with any civil force, or to try whether there was any resistance, actual or threatened, to his authority "too formidable to be overcome" by such force. In fact, he seems to have employed United States forces from the first instance on ordinary police duty, and so carelessly and recklessly that "a person," with no rights or authority but those of a bystander, was actually able to take command of a detachment for a short period at the door of the Assembly Hall.

The Louisiana Returning Board has accomplished the work for which it was created by giving the electoral vote of the State to Hayes and the gubernatorial vote to Packard, and returning four Republicans out of the six Congressmen. As this result was anticipated from the first, the announcement of it has caused no disturb-

ance. In South Carolina, the dual legislature having been broken up by the secession of the Democrats, the Republican Senators and what was left of the Mickey House got the start of the Supreme Court and met and canvassed the vote for Governor, and declared Chamberlain re-elected. Telegraphic communication with Florida has been temporarily interrupted.

A good many people during the shifting scenes of the Southern drama last week found their interest in the possible result giving way to curiosity as to how far some of the Republican organs would go in accepting and defending the operations of their active-minded friends down in South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana, and certainly some of the phenomena which met their gaze were very amusing, and recalled forcibly the frivolities of the Ducal Court of Gerolstein. For instance, we doubt if there ever occurred in that principality anything more comic and unlooked-for than Governor Stearns's announcement that he would count the vote himself, his change of mind and determination not to do so, and then his appearance by counsel before the Court after such change to resist a motion for an injunction restraining him from doing it. Then, in Louisiana, the Simple-Minded Strangers sent down by the President solemnly declared to the Democrats, when asked to join them in watching the Returning Board, that

"It is, in our judgment, vital to the preservation of constitutional liberty that the habit of obedience to the forms of law should be sedulously inculcated and cultivated, and that the resort to extra-constitutional modes of redress for even actual grievances should be avoided and condemned as revolutionary, disorganizing, and tending to disorder and anarchy."

But almost at the same moment, up in South Carolina, the Board of Canvassers were setting at naught the order of the Supreme Court, and the *Times* and *Tribune* in this city were justifying it, on the ground that the judges were bad fellows and had exceeded their jurisdiction. Indeed, an appeal was taken to these two papers, and the judgment of the court was reversed with some hesitation in an editorial article in the *Tribune* of the 29th ult., but reversed with a loud rattle in the *Times* of the same date, which commented with great severity on the action of the court below, declaring "that the orders issued have no parallel in the recorded practice of any court in Christendom." The court, however, defiantly locked up the canvassers for contempt. At this point Judge Bond, of the Federal Circuit Court, appeared on the scene and had the prisoners brought before him on a habeas corpus. Anywhere out of the Grand Duchy one would have supposed that the return that they were in custody for contempt by order of a State Court of Record would have led to the prompt dismissal of the writ. Instead of this he virtually released them by handing them over to the United States Marshal, who was of course prepared to defend them with troops. An appeal was taken from Judge Bond's action, before the return of the writ, to the *Times*, and it gave judgment in its issue of the 23rd ult. The point seemed to the outside world either clear against Judge Bond, or at all events knotty, but the *Times* gave the Supreme Court again a very severe wiggling, decided every point against it, and directed Judge Bond to discharge the men. The terms of the judgment, too, would have gone far to justify him in giving the members of the State Court fifty lashes apiece on the bare back. Indeed, it appeared from it that whenever the United States Circuit Court did not like the looks of things in the State courts in South Carolina it might have the whole concern brought up on a *certiorari* or other conveyance, and committed to the custody of "Dennis."

Our article last week on the duty of the Presidential electors at the present crisis has had one result of a somewhat comic character. It led Mr. Daniel E. Sickles to announce to the *Tribune* reporter that somebody had "traced a curious relation between some recent articles in the *Nation* and a well-known disciple of the paper in the old Bay State" (Mr. J. R. Lowell), and intimated that Mr. Lowell

might possibly take our advice and vote so as to throw the election into the House. This sent a tremor through the political ranks and caused additions to be promptly made to the story—viz., that Mr. Lowell had himself written the article and that he had "revised it," and finally he was interviewed and compelled to confess that he had not written it or revised it, or known anything about the writing of it, and had no intention, and never had had any, of doing what it suggested; which is all, of course, strictly accurate. What we have most enjoyed about the affair is that the party moralists, while feeling horror-stricken by our suggestion, have only suspected men of the very highest character of heeding it. "Here's baseness," they said, "and, good heavens! the most honorable men in the Electoral College are the very ones most likely to commit it. What are we coming to?" And then there was the now familiar rolling of eyes and holding up of hands.

As regards the merits of the question, we repeat that if any elector saw the force of our argument, and took our view of the nature of the crisis, he would have done right in following our advice; if he did not share our opinions, he would have done wrong. For we find any language our self-respect will permit us to use too feeble for adequate reprobation of the doctrine that any "understanding" with any human beings, and, above all, an understanding entered into in evasion or defiance of the law of the land, can reduce a citizen to the position of a mere brute instrument of another's will, condemn him absolutely to the discharge of functions to which a dog or a monkey would be equal, and so drown his reason and conscience that, having been deputed to fire a mine in order to clear a ship-channel, he is bound to do it though he discovers that the explosion will wreck a populous city. How does any cautious moralist dare to talk to us of the "strictly ministerial" nature of the elector's functions when he knows that he himself would heartily approve the diversion of a vote if it were discovered on the morning of election that Hayes, for instance, had become insane, or had committed a crime, or had entered into a corrupt compact with the Democrats? One great advantage of the pending discussions is that they are bringing to the surface the very dregs and sediment of party immorality, the deposits of years of cultivated mental and moral obliquity. As we look into the vat we hear psalm-singing, but we smell brimstone.

The suggestion that somebody in the Electoral College should so cast his vote as to throw the election into the House, and thus deliver the country from the mischief of a disputed election, although this would probably result in Mr. Tilden's election, and our questions addressed to Mr. Hayes with regard to his acceptance of the Presidency from the Louisiana Returning Board, have drawn out in some quarters the enquiry why, in the present crisis, the Republicans only should be called on to make the necessary sacrifices. We know how much the party has done within the last ten years to blunt the moral sense of the community, and yet, we confess, this surprises us. The reason why Republicans are asked to set matters right is, because Republicans hold the civil service, and the army and navy, and the revenue, and have used them all freely for partisan purposes in the late canvass; because every one of the Government officials from the President down has taken part in the campaign as a bitter partisan, and, in some cases, as that of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General, with great indecency; because all the Returning Boards in the doubtful States are controlled by Republicans, and, in some cases, contain candidates for office, and because if there be a *judicial* fraud or chicanery committed in examining the votes in those States it has been committed by Republicans.

Nor is it any answer to this that the Democrats have committed frauds too, and have been guilty of intimidation. The Democrats, brethren, have not committed judicial frauds, such as you are suspected of, and which are the worst of all frauds, and, though we do not doubt they have intimidated, the intimidation has not

been proved before any proper tribunal, and you have taken good care not to provide one. You cannot throw out votes on newspaper letters and telegrams, can you? Moreover, you have set an example of intimidation yourselves in forcing 60,000 or 70,000 office-holders to vote your ticket and subscribe to your election fund on pain of dismissal. Not being Guatemalans or Costa Ricans, therefore, you must perceive that you are, in the present crisis, the responsible party; that it is through you the wrong has come, if wrong there be, and it is to you, therefore, the country looks to see—much as it may cost you—that right be done.

There has not during the week been change enough in the political situation to dispel the doubts and fears which have so injuriously affected business since the Presidential election. The export trade is sustained by the probability that some time within the next six months there will be war in Europe. The import trade has fallen back to the diminutive proportions of the early part of last summer before the improvement which preceded the Presidential election had begun. Domestic exchanges represent only the business which is absolutely necessary, the contemplation even of new enterprises having been put off until after the settlement of the Presidential contest. Wall Street reflects the general dulness, and the volume of business at the Stock Exchange has been as small during the week as at any time in the dullest seasons. Gold continues to flow here from Europe, the importations of specie having been close on to \$2,500,000 in the last six days. At one time the decline in the price of U. S. new five per cent bonds in London, the advance in the rate of discounts to near the Bank of England rate, and the advance of half a penny by that institution in the price at which it sells American gold, were thought to indicate the beginning of the end of specie shipments from London to New York, but since then several new shipments have been made. Silver in London has advanced to 55½d. to 55¼d. per ounce, English standard, and the price here has advanced to \$1 19½ per ounce of 1,000 fine; at this price the gold value of the old silver dollar would be \$0.9242. The gold value of the U. S. legal-tender note for one dollar has ranged during the week between \$0.9174 and \$0.9248.

A ministerial crisis has arisen in France which may prove serious, the Left having not unexpectedly broken with M. Dufaure, President of the Council and Minister of Justice and Public Worship, over the estimates for ecclesiastical purposes. An attempt was made by one of the wilder Radicals to defeat the appropriation for the maintenance of the Legation at the Vatican, but Gambetta interfered here and with much good sense blocked the amendment, remembering how many pious Catholic voters there were in France. But the anti-clerical movement gained ground, and the vote for a Carmelite school was defeated by a heavy majority, followed by another blow of the same sort against clerical scholarships. The Government has also come to loggerheads with the Left over the refusal of the military authorities to permit military honors to be paid to members of the Legion of Honor who are buried without religious services. An attempt to make a compromise by bill failed in the Senate, and the acceptance by M. Marcère, the Minister of the Interior, of an Assembly resolution expressing confidence that the Government would in these burials respect liberty of conscience, seems to have exasperated M. Dufaure, and on Saturday, the day following his defeat on the scholarships, he resigned. The Due Decazes (Foreign Affairs) took the same view of M. Marcère's action, while M. Léon Say (Finance) and General Berthault (War) sided with him, and, the dissension growing more serious, all have resigned. The difficulty of the situation is that any ministry the majority of the Assembly would support would be too radical for Marshal MacMahon, and one the Senate would support would be too conservative, and people are waiting to see which he will rely on, or whether he will try to have a ministry of his own. Gambetta's organ recommends reconstruction under Léon Say without Dufaure, but, curiously enough, objects to any marked change in the Radical direction. Everything will now depend on the tact and good sense of the Marshal, and they will probably not fail him.

THE CIVIL SERVICE AND PARTY PASSION.

WE trust the bearing of the crisis through which the country is now passing on the question of civil-service reform is not lost on the multitudes of intelligent people to whom the events of the day are causing more than usually serious reflection. When the news that Tilden was elected was spread abroad on the 8th of November it caused consternation in every Government office in the country hardly less great than if a foreign enemy had seized on the capital. It caused tens of thousands to tremble for their subsistence and that of their families in the midst of a season of great business depression. Not only were they, as it seemed to them, threatened with loss of employment, but with the loss of all the advantage derived from experience—it might be of some years—in one kind of work. They were, they thought, going to be dismissed by a master who would give them no recommendation, and whose service did not fit them for that of anybody else. The reports from Washington said the scenes in many of the departments were distressing in the extreme. So, on the other hand, when the Republican papers on the following day began to show "grit," and maintain that Hayes was elected, there was wild rejoicing in the Government offices—as wild as if the enemy aforesaid had been unexpectedly beaten at the gates, and forced to retreat. In fact, putting the number of Government employees down at 80,000, it is safe to say that the result of the election was awaited by 50,000 households with intense anxiety, and that if Tilden is positively elected during the present week it will cause nearly as much wailing among women and children as would the occupation of a country by a victorious invading army.

That this state of things is a national shame and disgrace, all the deeper because in no other civilized country can it be witnessed, few will question, and yet we have taken only the sentimental view of it. There is a practical view in which it shows its dangerous as well as discreditable side. The practice of making a clean sweep of the office-holders when a new party comes into power gives a change of Administration something of the character of a revolution, and therefore rouses passions on both sides which are little short of revolutionary in their violence. It became evident at a very early period in the history of the Government that the Presidential election would be a process involving great strain to the whole political fabric, owing to the extreme reluctance of the party in power to surrender it, particularly after a long tenure of office. At the first change that occurred the Federalists stood very much in the position in which the Republicans now stand—that is, they were the party which had carried the country successfully through the Revolutionary War and had founded the new Government, and which contained, as they thought, the greater part of the religion, morality, and reverence for law of the whole country. The Republicans stood in the position now held by the Democrats, and were looked upon as atheists, Jacobins, communists, and profligates, who would, if admitted to power, imitate their French *confrères*, destroy the public credit, abolish marriage and property, and engage in "a carnival of crime." So strong was the feeling on this point that the best Federalist felt as if almost any measure would be justifiable in trying to prevent so horrible a consummation. Many of our readers will recall Hamilton's letter to Jay, when governor of New York (when the defeat of the Federalists in the State in 1800 promised an anti-Federal majority in the legislature), in which he proposed calling the existing legislature at once together, and giving the choice of the Presidential electors to the people in districts, which he said would ensure a majority of votes for a Federal candidate. He acknowledged that there were weighty objections to the measure, but added:

"In times like these in which we live it will not do to be over-scrupulous. It is easy to sacrifice the substantial interests of society by a strict adherence to ordinary rules. In observing this I shall not be supposed to mean that anything ought to be done which integrity will forbid; but merely that scruples of delicacy and propriety as relative to a common course of things ought to yield to the extraordinary nature of the crisis. They ought not to hinder the

taking of a legal and constitutional step to prevent an atheist in religion and a fanatic in politics [Thomas Jefferson] from getting possession of the helm of state."

How many arguments of this sort must have been used during the last month to and by the three now famous Returning Boards! And how like this sounds to an editorial article in *Harper's Weekly* on the Democrats:

"You know, sir, in a great degree, the anti-Federal party; but I fear you do not know them as well I do. It is a composition indeed of very incongruous materials, but all tending to mischief—some of them to the overthrow of the Government by stripping it of its due energies; others of them to a revolution after the manner of Bonaparte. I speak from indubitable facts, not from conjectures and inferences. In proportion as the true character of the party is understood is the force of the considerations which urge to every effort to disappoint it, and it seems to me there is a very solemn obligation to employ the means in our power."

And how like this is to a possible editorial article in the *New York Times* after Tilden's election, from a speech ascribed to Mr. Theodore Dwight before the Connecticut Society of Cincinnati in 1801 after Jefferson's election:

"We have now reached the consummation of Democratic blessedness. We have a country governed by blockheads and knaves; the ties of marriage with all its felicities are severed and destroyed; our wives and daughters are thrown into the stews; our children are cast into the world from the breast forgotten; filial piety is extinguished, and our surnames, the only mark of distinction among families, are abolished. Can imagination paint anything more dreadful this side of hell? Some parts of the subject are, indeed, fit only for horrid contemplation."

We do not mean to push the illustration so far as to say that there are no better reasons for distrusting the Democrats now than there were for distrusting the Republicans then; but, on the other hand, the Federalists had claims to popular confidence, in the character of their leaders and the nature of their services, which our Republican Group are far enough from possessing. Our object is simply to show the state of frantic alarm and *unscrupulousness* into which an intelligent and honorable party could even then work itself at the prospect of its own expulsion from office, although the spoils system had not been invented, and the tremors of the chiefs were not felt among the clerks and waiters, and the machinery of state was small and cheap. The experience recurred again when the Jeffersonians under their new name of Democrats reached the limits of their usefulness. From 1852 to 1860 they rent the air with accounts of the horrors that would follow a Republican victory, and began that unflinching use of the Civil Service as an electioneering machine which the Republicans have since carried to its last limits. The district-attorneys, marshals, collectors, and postmasters were taught to cast aside the last shreds of decorum and restraint, and devote themselves to the unblushing practice of the partisanship of which our friend Mr. Bliss is the perfected flower. They turned the navy-yards into beds of corruption, and they began the practice of organizing State legislatures with troops which President Grant has extended and improved, and it was all defended on the ground that the country would be ruined if "the Black Republicans" got into power. The Southerners were sincere in their belief, and seceded when everything else had failed.

We have during the late canvass been witnessing the use of the same tactics under the influence of the same ideas, and we have no doubt we shall witness them again. When a party has remained in power ten or fifteen years, and used all the resources of the country as if they belonged to the party, it naturally gets into the way of thinking and talking of itself as if it were the nation, and as if its enemies were Catilines who had designs on the very existence of the Government. The late Republican canvass has, in fact, consisted almost exclusively of the preaching of this idea, and a certain weight and solemnity has been given to it by the fact that to the prodigious body of office-holders whom it now has in its pay the campaign was a fight for life. One of the most repulsive features of the system is that, after the fight is over, if the party in power is de-

feated, all these unfortunates are left at the mercy of the victor. The Chandlers and Camerons and Blaines, who have dragged them into the fray and put them in the position of active enemies of the other side, slink off to their comfortable homes, and the wretched subordinates are left to meet in a Christian country a punishment of atrocious cruelty inflicted for no offence known to the law, and working in its infliction infinite mischief to the public.

It is the interest of the honest people whose taxes and power furnish the stakes in the political game that the spirit of desperation and unscrupulousness should, as far as the weakness of human nature will permit, be taken out of Presidential contests, and it is their duty to take it out. Good government requires that the change of Administration should be as easy as is consistent with calm and deliberation, and that there should be no more strain caused by it and no greater obstacles to it than the Constitution has made necessary; and the very first test which ought to be applied to the incoming President, whoever he may be, is the civil-service test. Mr. Hayes has profited by, if he has not connived at, the most widespread and reckless use of the civil service for electioneering purposes ever witnessed, and we should expect at his hands, as the first evidence of reforming zeal, the stoppage of this system, not in name only but in reality, and the prompt dismissal of all prominent officials who, having been active in it, have been debauched by it, and rendered unfit for the ordinary duties of their places. Look at Dennis, for instance, "the furniture man" and United States marshal, who "assumed judicial functions" and took command of the United States troops the other day in the South Carolina State-House. Look at Messrs. Bliss and Raum, who have been getting up "campaign charges" against Mr. Tilden in their official capacity. No reformed and well-ordered Government service in our day has any place for such men. And if Mr. Tilden should come in and apply the spoils system in any degree whatever, or for any reasons which he cannot or will not put on paper, to the trembling multitude who will await his advent in the Government offices, or use his power for simple vengeance, he may rely upon it no plea of Republican equality in badness will save him from just reprobation, and he will throw away an opportunity of earning a splendid and enduring fame such as has been offered to none of his predecessors except Lincoln. The people are tired of the *vos quoque* argument. Recrimination has lost its force. "Well, is the other party any better?" has become a street joke.

PRESIDENT GRANT'S USE OF THE TROOPS.

THERE is more or less talk, at this writing, of the impeachment of the President and Secretary of War when Congress meets, for their unlawful use of the troops in South Carolina. Granting everything that may be claimed by way of defence for sending the troops to Columbia to help Governor Chamberlain to preserve the peace at the opening of the Legislature, we know of no way of defending their presence in the State-House except to quell a riot in which the police had been overwhelmed. That Mr. Chamberlain had stationed any police, or sheriff's posse, or other civil force ordinarily used in the preservation of order in the State, in preparation for the opening, or that any such force was called on or talked of by anybody, nowhere appears. That this force—the police or a posse commanded by the sheriff—should be the first resort of an American governor in all cases of apprehended violence we do not need to inform our readers. It is to police, in as large force as he may consider necessary, that his first resort should always be, and above all on an occasion so delicate and needing so much attention to appearances as the meeting of a legislature. To this force soldiers may be a proper supplement or reserve; but supplement or reserve, and nothing more, they should always remain. In Columbia, however, they seem to have been used as police from the first moment as freely and apparently with as little sense of indecorum as in Paris in 1851. They were in possession not only of the State-House, but of the hall of the Legislature, and the members could only reach their seats on satisfying the corporal of the guard, who in

his turn appears to have been under the orders of one Dennis, a United States marshal, a carpet-bagger, an old member of the Scott Ring, concerned in the famous job for furnishing the State-House of which we published some particulars at the time, and in other respects like most of his kind.

The simple and constitutional course would seem to have been to have the troops in Columbia, and perhaps, if thought advisable, in the neighborhood of the State-House and under arms, but to warn Chamberlain and his friends that they could only be called on when it had been plainly demonstrated that his civil force was unable to preserve order or quell disorder, and then to confine them to the simple task of keeping the peace, leaving the question of the qualifications of the members to be determined in the usual way, or not determined at all. Has the spectacle ever been witnessed out of the United States of an armed corporal of the guard passing on the validity of election certificates at the door of a legislature? Troops are used under military monarchies for all sorts of purposes which we consider very reprehensible, but we do not think they have ever been used with such gross indecency as in this case and that of Louisiana. They have twice in France and once in England turned a legislature out of doors, but then in all these cases it was freely acknowledged that it was a revolutionary proceeding, intended to effect a change of government. Our use of troops in the organization of legislatures, on the contrary, takes place apparently as a part of the regular machinery of constitutional government.

Nor can it be pleaded that what has occurred in South Carolina is a surprise or the result of an oversight, or that General Ruger is to blame. This is the third time that the organization of a legislature under the supervision of a military force has taken place under General Grant's administration. When the last affair of this kind occurred in Louisiana two years ago, his attention was fully called to the criminality of this use of the troops, and he acknowledged it, but pleaded ignorance of what had occurred until all was over. So that, knowing the circumstances under which the soldiers were called for in South Carolina, he ought to have guarded against the repetition of the Louisiana scenes by full and minute instructions to the commanding officer, and if Mr. Cameron did not give these he was guilty of criminal negligence.

Nor are we prepared to deny that in a *prima-facie* view of the case impeachment may be the duty of the House. If there be an offence which as a general rule ought to bring down impeachment it is this, for it strikes at the very vitals of constitutional government, and acquiescence in it would be a long step towards Mexicanization. Moreover, we do not think the impossibility of securing a conviction from the Senate of itself a sufficient reason for not bringing the charge, because the object of impeachment would be partially attained by putting on record in the most striking way the reprobation of the popular branch of the Legislature directed against such acts. In fact, this seems to us the strongest argument in favor of impeachment. Future generations ought to know that though such things were done in our time, and though there were practical difficulties in the way of punishing them, they were none the less deemed illegal by the authorized exponents of popular sentiment, and were solemnly stigmatized as such. We do not deem this a conclusive argument, however, for the reason that the same end can be reached by resolution properly drawn and debated.

But then, after considering everything that can be said in favor of it, we hope the Democrats will not attempt it. They must remember that the thing which most oppresses the public mind just now is the danger of confusion at the moment of the transfer of the power from one President to another, and that what does most to secure them any support they are receiving, or likely to receive, from Republicans at the present crisis is the desire for peace and quiet, and for a speedy return to the normal working of the political machine. Any step, therefore, which prolonged or intensified the excitement, or increased the uncertainty about the future, would surely in the long run bring down great indignation on the authors, however good their motives might be. They would, therefore, do

well to let impeachment alone, for the same reason that they will do well to avoid all violence of speech and behavior. There are, too, some special reasons why the country can afford to overlook many of General Grant's misdeeds and shortcomings. He is, in a peculiar degree, the product of the Civil War. He had no claims to the office except such as the war gave him; and though these were tolerably strong in 1864, they had ceased to exist in 1872; and if we condemn his re-nomination, as well we may, by the Republicans in that year, we must remind the Democrats that they powerfully contributed to his re-election by making a nomination of their own which it is no exaggeration to call farcical. But that such another man is likely in our time, or in that of our children, to find his way into the Presidential chair is altogether unlikely. One result of his ignorance, combined with his military training, is that he is badly advised. His Cabinets have been too largely comprised of personal favorites selected without reference to their antecedents, and offering the public but few guarantees in the shape of experience or character. The result has been that they have largely contented themselves on critical occasions with humoring him. His personal friends, too, are nearly all ordinary and ignorant men, to whom politics is but a game of euchre with heavy stakes. To impeach a President with such surroundings would have many of the characteristics of a farce. There ought to be some formal condemnation of his conduct, but, for the rest, we must bear with him to the end.

We must remember, too, in judging him that he has really been encouraged in nearly all his doubtful acts by large numbers of good Republicans, whose state of mind has for students of politics the same value, as an illustration, that "rudimentary organs" in the animal frame have for students of biology and comparative anatomy, in recalling long-lost functions and extinct modes of life. When one heard an American refusing to raise his voice two years ago against the misuse of military force in Louisiana, or heard him lately refusing to condemn the use of it in Carolina, out of gratitude for "Grant's services in the war," or "because the South has brought it all on herself"—or, in other words, expressing readiness to sacrifice the Constitution of his country to some sentiment or passion of his own—one saw a portion of the process by which so many free governments have in other ages been destroyed. The lesson is none the less instructive, too, because no immediate mischief is perceptible from such talk. The prison of which states perish is as slow and insidious as the approach of old age in a healthy man. It is impossible to say when its effects were first felt, when the habits of legality on which freedom rests were first weakened; but some day, on looking back ten, twenty, or thirty years, we see that the vigilance, the sense of decorum, the righteous indignation, the keen jealousy of all stretches of power by which freedom is maintained and defended, are no longer as available as they once were for repression and punishment. We know all that can be said in proof of *our* security. It is mostly sound and true; but we entreat of those honest and well-meaning men who are so convinced of the value of the Republican party as the defence of real liberty and order against the assaults of ignorance, violence, and cupidity that they are ready to pardon almost any device for keeping it in power, to remember the enormous body of voters which is every year being added to the ranks of their opponents without any political training or experience, and but little idea of the public good apart from the immediate gratification of their own desires, and to beware how they furnish precedents to this restless mass of wild desire. "Troops" are very tempting instruments of justice, but do not be too sure that they will always be used in ways good Americans will approve. Do not be too sure that *your* man, or any man in whom you have the least confidence, will always be in the White House to command the army and navy. Those who wish to make this Government the champion of order and freedom and morality will do well to stand fast by the law in its letter no less than its spirit, and to remember the great lesson that it is only by suffering single wrongs and small wrongs to go now and then unredressed, by discerning keenly the disorders

that are slight and transitory from those that are deep-seated and dangerous, that the supremacy of great principles can be maintained.

THE "NEOPHOGEN," OR NEW-LIGHT-PRODUCING, COLLEGE.

IT is not our practice to call attention editorially to schools or colleges, but the attractions of the "Neophogen" (or New-Light-Producing) "Male and Female College" of Gallatin, Tennessee, seem to us so remarkable that we feel that our rule will, on this occasion, be truly more honored in the breach than in the observance. We hope we have properly translated the President's Greek. The semi-annual catalogue of December, 1875, which now lies before us—and which, we are ashamed to say, only came into our hands very recently—informs us by a small, well-executed map on the frontispiece that the college lies in Sumner County, the area of which is 533 square miles. Turning the leaf we come on lithographed portraits of the eight "honor-students" of the college—four male and four female—headed by that of the President himself, who is apparently a man of commanding presence and ripe culture, though, if we might criticise at all, we should say that his appearance in full evening dress without a cravat is a regrettable departure from what we consider sound and well-established usage. It is the more to be deplored because "Etiquette" forms a prominent feature in the college course. Indeed, the catalogue says that "Etiquette is a Specialty, not a matter of choice [in the curriculum] but compulsion," and that

"The course of training in it is, in great part, original. Here it is the theory with continued practice. We think we have the politest students in America. The salutation, the bow, the courtesy, the word, the tone, the look, the inflection, vocal and physical, the attitude, the hand, the feet, the spine, and eye are all observed and studied, and the students daily exercised in them."

How the Head of a College who observes and studies even the spines of his students, and exercises the students in their spines in the interest of Etiquette, could be guilty of so great a solecism as sitting for his portrait without a necktie, we own puzzles us, but we dare say it can, and, when attention is called to it, will be explained. Another "Specialty" is the English language, the neglect of which in our institutions of learning the President justly mourns, and says he "has known many talented and ingenious men possessed of great knowledge, whose contributions to our literary wealth would have been invaluable, yet they were deterred from writing for the public eye in consequence of their imperfect knowledge of English grammar"; and he adds, doubtless having some neighboring seminaries in his eye: "Many graduates from some of the female colleges ought to be introduced to a very *unpopular* [the italics are doubtless sarcasm] little work called the 'Elementary Spelling-Book,' " "and would," he observes scornfully, "were they to enter *this* school." In fact, he offered a one-hundred-dollar gold medal in 1875 to any student of a Kentucky or Tennessee college who should beat his students in the English language. We need hardly say that nobody was bold enough to compete for the prize. As regards terms, the college is the "cheapest in America," partly owing to the low prices of necessities in Sumner County, but mainly to the fact that the President has "broken the shackles of mental servitude, and is guided by no landmarks in teaching that reason, common sense, and experience do not approbate," and he justly observes "that price is not an evidence of quality. Plato taught in a grove; Socrates everywhere, and brick and mortar are poor substitutes for talent."

The college, as we have before said, is a coeducator, and contained last year about 110 male and about 75 female students, the intercourse between whom, however, seems to us to be unduly restricted, considering the lofty character of the instruction. The sexes study in separate halls, but "the young ladies and gentlemen are permitted, we may say required, to have interviews in the drawing rooms twice in each month," and "the refining, elevating, and stimulating effects of these associations," we are told, "must be seen to be appreciated." Here, as on the subject of the cravat, we must respectfully but firmly dissent from President Walton. We question much whether any young gentleman—we can only answer for our own sex—was ever "stimulated" or "elevated" by a compulsory fortnightly interview with a girl or girls. We of course speak without practical experience of the system, but we put it to the President whether he has not made his statement a little too sweeping, and whether the interviews have taken place with sufficient frequency to enable him to speak with positiveness as to their effects, and whether he has ever tried the voluntary system in his capacious and tasteful parlors. Among the degrees are "M.E.L."

(Master or Mistress of the English Language), "B.A.L.L." or "M.A.L.L." (Bachelor or Maid of the Ancient Languages), "B.P." or "M.P." (Bachelor or Maid of Philosophy), and "B.F.A." or "M.F.A." (Bachelor or Maid of Fine Arts), which requires Music, Drawing, Painting, and Wax work. There are several degrees for Bachelors and Maids besides these, but we have selected the most remarkable and attractive. Honorary degrees, we are glad to perceive, "are only conferred on the *pre cunctatim* worthy," and the pastor of the Presbyterian church at Gallatin has received one and is now a "Doctor of Divinity" of the College.

On the general advantages of the College, which we believe has been in existence ten or twelve years, we hardly feel competent to expatiates, and only wish we could place a copy of the catalogue in the hands of every one of our readers. The Institution is "centrally located between the North and South, the East and the West" (a circumstance which alone would distinguish it from every other college in the world), and is surrounded by scenery to the description of which President Walton's pen, although he is professor of "Belles-Lettres," is evidently not equal, but he does remark that his district "is the land of the poet's dream and the home of the artist's heart"—a very unusual combination, to speak moderately. As to the city of Gallatin, he says that "Health and Wealth are here combined with 3,500 citizens who cannot be surpassed for intelligence and refinement," and he adds, "that no parallel can be found, estimating the population, to the ten first-class turnpikes" that lead into the city. The "combination of health and wealth with 3,500 refined and intelligent citizens" and "ten first-class turnpikes" would suffice to make Gallatin a remarkable place, but this is not all. The President "claims for Gallatin and its vicinity" (the italics are ours) "that true virtue and magnanimity found alone in the most refined society. Here," says he, "identity is lost in public spirit"—which must cause some confusion in the streets and on the turnpikes—"here a studious observance of the rights of others is ever manifested." We confess on reading this we were led to fear that the inhabitants gave themselves airs and tried to live in haughty seclusion from the hardy agriculturists of the surrounding region. But President Walton, doubtless anticipating this morbid anxiety, goes on to explain: "While we studiously ignore the idea of aristocracy and nobility, our minds are pleasantly associated with dignity and purity."

We regret to perceive in the catalogue some evidence that the President's pure and dignified mind is more or less troubled by the low and sordid cares of real-estate speculation, for he offers "liberal terms to families wishing to purchase lots and improve them"; but the momentary pain which this discovery caused us was dissipated completely when we turned the page and our eye rested on the following noble offer to "Learned Men," which we reproduce in full, and with emotion which we make no attempt to conceal:

"Learned men who have failed in business are tendered every inducement to take a life-home here. We intend to take the most active measures to raise a large life-fund for the relief of unfortunate literary men. Let them have homes and the Society of Congenial Spirits."

BALZAC'S CORRESPONDENCE.

PARIS, November 18.

AMONG French novelists none holds a more eminent place than Honoré de Balzac. There is also none probably who has been more extensively read out of France. His "Comédie humaine" has been considered a true exponent of Parisian and provincial life. Balzac is a wonderful creator; he has given life to any number of types, and it was a very happy idea of his to reintroduce his old heroes in his new novels, so that you finally almost believe in the reality of the Rastignacs, the Bixious, the Nucingens, etc., whom you meet everywhere. In one sense Balzac may also be called prophetic. It will perhaps astonish my readers if I say that Balzac described less the society of his own quiet bourgeois time than the society which was coming—the society of the Empire. He was like those men who see the shadow of coming events. Living in the great Parisian centre, as sensitive as a nervous centre, like a spider in the middle of his web, he saw, he studied these curious characters which afterwards became predominant—the unprincipled and clever journalist, the elegant rogue, the gambler, the corrupt functionary, the *lorette*, the duchess of the Faubourg St. Germain, who was no better than the *lorette*. We have all seen the "Comédie humaine" in full bloom under the Empire. Rastignac helped to make the *coup d'état*; I could name him, and tell how many millions he took from the coffers of the state: he accomplished his programme to the letter. Balzac shows him after the funeral of the old Père Goriot, whom he alone

had followed to the grave in the cold mist of the morning, sad, vengeful, turning towards the great capital extended before his feet: "À nous deux maintenant." He became a minister, a millionaire; he continued to be an "homme à bonnes fortunes." Dixon wrote pamphlets on the Eastern or on the Roman question. We have, so to speak, lived with these men; we have known the heroines and the heroes of Balzac. When I happen by chance to fall on an old volume of his, it seems as if my youth were rising before me. Many a drama have I seen darker than the dramas of Balzac's, but it must be confessed that he has entered deeper than any man into the depths of human nature. His instincts were corrupt, his intelligence was wonderfully lucid and receptive. He was wiser than the wisest; he saw that the handmaiden parliamentary régime did not much suit the French temper; he despised the Crevels, the commanders of that national guard who abandoned Louis Philippe in 1828. He had, like Mérimée, like Henri Beyle, a certain attraction for the iron types of the First Empire. He understood also the French peasant, who still nurses in his heart the hatreds of centuries.

Two volumes of Balzac's correspondence, extending from 1819 to 1820, have just been published, and it was impossible that they should not be read with much interest. Before I opened the two volumes, however, I said to myself, It is impossible that Balzac should be a model of epistolary art, and my reason was simply this: Balzac was too busy to enjoy the luxury of writing good letters. It is only your idle man who can polish a letter: the slaves of modern literature, those who must provide for the intellectual food of the devouring millions, cannot waste their time in the pretty details of a letter. Among your correspondents you will always find that the only good letters come from those who have leisure. Mme. de Sévigné, Walpole, Mme. du Deffand, Paul-Louis Courier, Mme. de Maintenon, all had hours and days to spare. Balzac was, on the contrary, one of the most indefatigable producers of his time; the mere material labor of writing all he did write is stupendous. Add to it the intellectual effort, and you will clearly understand that Balzac only wrote letters when he was forced to do so. I have heard all the readers of the two volumes of this correspondence complain that there was so constantly a question of money in it. It was to be expected; most of the letters before us were in reality business letters. Balzac had, besides, what may be called the financial mania; he thought that his brain could engender millions as it did heroes and heroines. He was an incessant schemer, a speculator; he never ceased to adore Fortune, and to believe that the blind goddess would some day adopt him, and take him as a favorite.

We find him in 1819 in Paris, whither he had gone secretly; all the friends of his family had been told that he was gone to make a visit to a cousin in Alby. He was writing his first book, and his sister, Laura de Balzac, was his principal confidant. This sister sent him his father's old clothes, which were refitted for him by a small tailor. He had not money enough to go to the Théâtre-Français. He was happy "to live after my fancy, to work after my taste; not to do anything, if I like; to dream of the future, to think of you whom I know to be happy; to have for my mistress the 'Julie' of Rousseau, for friends La Fontaine and Molière, Racine for master, and the Père-Lachaise for a promenade! Oh! I wish this could always last." He was at that time writing tragedies; he prepared a "Cromwell." In 1822 he sells his "Héritage de Lingue" for 100 francs, and he is proud to say that 1,000 francs have been promised for his next novel. He was even paid more generously: "Jean-Louis" brought him 1,300 francs; "Clotilde de Lusignan," 2,000 francs. He makes contracts for other novels, and is paid beforehand, partly in cash, partly in bills. "I make the finest projects in the world," he writes to his sister Laura, now become Madame de Surville: "when my novels are worth 2,000 francs, I will take a wise and faithful wife, if I can, and bury myself in a pretty home as new and well-varnished as a German toy. An author ought to be married; somebody must take care of his fortune, of his house; Madame de Balzac, junior, will be very happy." Balzac's head is in constant ebullition. As soon as he has written something he is disgusted with it. Finding himself in 1825 in a very precarious position, he undertook to publish the French classics in new editions. This speculation was unsuccessful, and was abandoned after the publication of one volume of Molière and one volume of La Fontaine. He had bought a printing office for this object, and in 1827 was obliged to sell it at a heavy loss. When he had first arrived in Paris, he was only poor; now he was in debt. "A postage-stamp, an omnibus fare are expenses which I have to abstain from, and I do not go out in order not to wear my clothes" (1827—Letter to Mme. de Surville). He writes the "Chouans," and has time to send long letters to Mme. d'Abremès, a now forgotten celebrity. We find in one of this curious passage:

"I have the most singular character I know. I study myself as I would another man; in my five feet two inches I contain all possible contrasts, and those who think me vain, prodigal, obstinate, light, without method in my ideas, conceited, neglectful, lazy, unthinking, inconstant, tactless, ill-bred, rude, uneven, cross, will be quite as right as those who may say that I am economical, modest, brave, tenacious, energetic, hardworking, constant, taciturn, polite, always cheerful. Whoever says that I am a coward will be no more in the wrong than those who say that I am extremely brave. Full of knowledge, full of ignorance; talented or stupid—nothing of myself astonishes me. I come to believe that I am an instrument on which circumstances play."

Such an instrument was destined to be an admirable reflection of all the passions, sentiments, instincts of a time. The letters which I prefer in the collection are those addressed to Mme. de Surville. Balzac had a real affection for his sister; he tried to amuse her in his letters; he was more sincere with her than with anybody else. There is a great deal of what we call in French *gentillesse* in the effusions of the tired, worn-out literary hack when he can talk freely with his kind, virtuous sister. The very thought of her is to his sick Parisian heart like a fresh breeze from the provinces. This gives an idea of his life: "My poor and unfortunate publisher! the finest girl in the world can only give what she has. I work the whole day at my 'Physiologie du Mariage,' and only give five hours of the night—from nine to two—to the 'Scènes de la Vie privée,' the proofs of which I am correcting. . . ." He explains why he cannot send more manuscript: "There is something in me which hinders me from doing wrong consciously; we must give some future to this book; the question is whether we shall sell this blackened paper seven francs the ream or fifty francs. If, like the Nodiers (Nodier is a sub-genus in the natural history of literature), I lounged about and made prospectuses, and played billiards; if I ate, if I drank, etc.—but no, I have not an idea, I make not a step, which is not the 'Physiology'; I dream of it."

The 'Physiology of Marriage' did not please some of his best and early friends. He defends himself in this way to a Mme. Carraud, the wife of an officer, an honest lady who had always known him: "The sentiment of repulsion which you have felt, Madame, in reading the first pages of the book which I have brought to you, is too honorable to you and too delicate to give offence to any mind, even to the mind of the author. It proves that you do not belong to a world of falseness and perfidy, that you do not belong to a society which dishonors everything, and you are still worthy of the solitude in which man always becomes so great, noble, and pure." He goes on in this vein, and says that she had better continue reading the work; that he is as innocent of what he describes as Juvenal, Boileau, Rabelais were of the crimes and follies which they depicted. She would not be reconciled with the work, however, and he had to calm her wrath by bringing her the 'Scènes de la Vie privée,' a work certainly more worthy of his genius than the nauseous immoralities of the 'Physiology.'

He was always happy to leave Paris and to return to his dear Touraine, which he so often and so fondly described. Touraine is the centre of France, the cradle of our own peculiar genius. "Oh!" he exclaims to the director of a newspaper, "if you only knew what Touraine is! There you forget everything. I forgive its inhabitants for being stupid, they are so happy; and you know that people who are very happy are naturally stupid. . . . I have come to look upon glory, parliament, politics, the future, literature, like so many poisoned pills thrown to vagrant dogs, and I say: 'Virtue, happiness, life, are simply six hundred francs of income on the shores of the Loire.'" He compares Touraine to a truffled pie which he is in up to his chin. The provincial note is perhaps the most striking in Balzac. The dull, soft touches of its ponderous life are always found in contrast, in his stupendous work, with the glare, the noise, the turbulent emotions of the capital.

Correspondence.

THE CENTENNIAL ART AWARDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I beg leave to explain a misunderstanding with regard to the action of Group 27 in your recent article upon the Centennial awards.

The judges who examined the paintings endeavored to make a standard within which awards were recommended. The Group, in one of its early meetings, limited the number of medals to be given to oil paintings only. They made no reference to water colors or sculpture. But the Committee on Paintings acted, as they should, independently of this limitation, and

in fact gave fewer medals than the number first proposed by the Group, recommending only those works coming within this standard. It is a mistake, therefore, to suppose that more medals were not given to England because of any limit. The judges did not in any way consider the question whether or not the works of Royal Academicians should be excluded in favor of "second-best paintings"; indeed, some of the English awards were conferred upon members of the Royal Academy, as in the case of Sir Francis Grant. The English judge, Mr. Cope, R.A., made some such suggestion to his confrères at home, but if any answer was received it came after the committee had concluded its labors (June 25) and dispersed. If the action of the judges in painting and sculpture did, as you say, "result in the practical defeat of the intentions of the system," it was the fault of the system. But this defeat was not due to the causes you have "pointed out," but rather to the impossibility of carrying out the most characteristic part of the system.

I refer to the requirement that an individual judge should write an opinion of the subject of award, which opinion was to receive the signatures of approval of the other judges. You state in praise of this system:

"If three sewing-machines were selected for commendation, the judges would not say that one was the best, another the second best, and the other the third best, but would give an award to one because of its adaptability to the whole range of domestic work, to another (of high cost) as working perfectly in cambric, cloth, or leather, and to the third because, although less effective than either of the others for their special purposes, it was sufficiently good for ordinary family use, and could be furnished at a price within the reach of very poor people. So, through the whole range of the Exhibition, and in every department, the good qualities of the selected exhibits were to be authoritatively described, and this was supposed to constitute a value, especially for advertising purposes, far beyond the mere statement that an exhibit had received the 'first' prize—no reasons being stated."

Surely you would not apply this plan to a work of art? No two persons could agree in all respects with regard to a painting or statue, and most art-lovers would differ in a very positive manner upon many questions of color, composition, tone, and drawing. At the same time, they would all admit the general merit of a work of art. It seems, therefore, that the plan adopted by the Committee on Painting and Sculpture was most excellent. Instead of writing out criticisms of these works of art, which expressed only the opinion of its author, and which other judges might refuse to sign, the following classification was made: Historical, Religious, etc.; Genre, Landscape, Portrait, Animal and Still Life. They filled in the recommendation for awards. The expression is, "For artistic excellence," which was sufficiently significant and met with the approval of all the judges.

The letter of Mr. Nichols, Secretary of Group 27, published in a former number of the *Nation*, was a very clear and just statement of the facts in this case. I hope that I have shown there has been no "muddle" in this affair, except that the Centennial Commission attempted to put in practice a system of awards which could not be applied to objects of art.

Very truly yours,

FRANK HILL SMITH,

One of the Judges on Painting and Sculpture, Group 27.

Boston, Nov. 28, 1876.

REPUBLICAN INCONSISTENCIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is amusing to see the tender regard which Republican journals are now evincing for the Constitution of the United States. Some optimist may see in this a good sign; to me it smacks of hypocrisy. These same journals have watched with apparent calm the course of their party for the last twelve years, and have on several important occasions been silent witnesses to measures the constitutionality of which were plainly indefensible. For a partial list of such measures I would refer to Vol. XVI. of the *Nation*, page 89.

The Boston *Daily Advertiser* of last Saturday contained an article, entitled "The Only Safe Guide," in which it pointed to the Constitution as the supreme authority in the present political crisis, maintaining the necessity of adhering to the very letter, and concluding that constitutionally "the right of enquiry into the qualification of electors is in the States, and goes no further." But the *Advertiser* strangely forgets the past, so full of dangerous Republican precedents, of which it should make confession if it would have us believe in its sincerity. The truth is its conscience was aroused by visions of the Democratic Devil.

For, Mr. Editor, I should like the *Advertiser* to prove to me the constitutionality of the now celebrated Twenty-second Joint Rule, passed by a Republican Congress, and I should like the *Advertiser* to show me how the rejection of the electoral vote of a State differs materially from a Congressional "enquiry into the qualification of electors"?

The New York *World* of January 21, 1873, has a long article bearing on this subject, containing plenty of quotation from an elaborate speech by Senator Morton of Indiana. Senator Morton said of this same Twenty-second Joint Rule that it was "the most dangerous contrivance to the peace of the nation that has been invented by Congress—a torpedo planted in the straits, with which the ship of state may at some time come into fatal collision." "A power so vast and dangerous cannot be created as a mere rule of proceedings."

It may be replied by the apologists of the Republican party that this rule was adopted as an extraordinary measure, to meet an extraordinary need; that certain States were at the time of its adoption in an abnormal condition, and that, as a war measure, it was necessary.

But, my Republican friends, does not this play into the hands of the Democrats? For what will you say of the condition of the States of South Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana to-day? Does not the presence of troops in these States argue an abnormal state of things? And is not the use of troops in the South to oversee the election itself a war-measure? And since nobody believes in the integrity of the Returning Boards in the Southern States above mentioned, is it at all strange that the Democrats desire some legislation which will either restore to them or give them something in place of the famous *Republican* Twenty-second Joint Rule? B.

Boston, Nov. 27, 1876.

INCOMPETENT SPECIALISTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I wish to thank you for your timely rebuke of those who pass judgment on specialists as weak, without having mastered their specialty. I am a specialist myself, and have often suffered in that way. But I have been worried still worse by another class, whom also I wish you would warn off, the incompetent specialists. They are always carping, and they are legion. In my department there are at least two thousand specialists in America who sit in judgment on everything one says, while there are but two whose opinion is worth anything—one, the illustrious professor at Harvard, whose well-deserved fame makes it unnecessary to name him; the other, one whom modesty forbids me to mention.—Yours,

SPECIALIST.

Notes.

THE Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University are prepared, if convinced of the want of such a periodical, to assist in the publication of an American *Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*. A circular to elicit an expression of views on this subject has been issued under the signatures of Professors J. J. Sylvester, Simon Newcomb, Henry A. Rowland, and William E. Story.—Joel Munsell announces 'The Founders of Maryland,' by Rev. Edward D. Neill.—Mr. W. J. Stillman is preparing a short history of the insurrection in Herzegovina and war in Montenegro, which he witnessed as correspondent of the *London Times*. The volume will approach in size his 'History of the Cretan Insurrection of 1866-7-8.'—The Water-Color Society will hold its tenth annual exhibition at the National Academy of Design from Jan. 23 to March 4. Entries must be made on or before Jan. 8, and original works will be received from Jan. 10 to Jan. 12 inclusive. The Secretary is Mr. J. C. Nicoll, 51 West Tenth Street.

—A specially noteworthy memoir has just been published by the Museum of Comparative Zoölogy, Cambridge, as No. 10 of Vol. IV. of the 'Memoirs,' and it also forms the second part of the first volume of the *Memoirs of the Kentucky Geological Survey*, as explained in a preliminary note by Prof. N. S. Shaler, Director of the Survey, such simultaneous publication under two auspices being deemed advisable to secure wider circulation for so important a contribution to science. The article is Mr. J. A. Allen's 'Monograph of the American Bisons,' in which both the fossil species and the living buffalo, *Bison Americanus*, are exhaustively treated in elaborate detail by one of the most competent of American therologists. It bears upon its face the evidence of an immense amount of well-directed research,

and will probably never lose the place it at once takes as the article upon the subject. The bulk of it is occupied with the history, and especially the geographical distribution, past and present, of the living species, worked out to the most minute particulars with a degree of painstaking past all praise; while the structure, natural history, and economic relations of the most important indigenous mammal of North America are treated with equal fidelity. The plates (twelve in number) illustrate details of the osseous structure of the several species of bison; the map shows instructively the areas inhabited at different periods, and the gradual restriction of habitat of an animal which Mr. Allen believes doomed to extermination at no distant day.

—“W. H. W.” writes us: “I desire to ask whether there were published any numbers of the *St. Chrysostom's Magazine* after No. 12 of Vol. II., which appeared in February, 1875. In that number and a previous one there appeared certain letters said to be written by Rev. Robert Ratcliffe, from Boston, in 1686, and published, for the first time, from the originals. As the authenticity of these documents has been questioned, I should like to know if any more were published in the *St. Chrysostom's Magazine* or elsewhere, and especially I would ask if any one knows where the originals now are. As appearing in a 'religious' magazine, these letters ought to have no doubt rest upon them. If they were merely a work of imagination the author should avow his reprehensible ingenuity.”

—“T. S.” writes us:

“Your Baltimore correspondent's remarks on p. 301 of the current volume are merely tentative, which will be my excuse for venturing an unscientific suggestion of the 'principle' he seeks. Suppose we extend our enquiry by looking, in the 'expressions meaning a blow,' for the root, at least, of a word signifying any object with which a blow may conveniently be struck, whether the same be a 'fruit' or any other easily-handled missile, for the 'date, fig, nut, and pear' could hardly be used as offensive weapons save in throwing. Your friend asks for names of fruits used similarly in English. *Pomme* occurs to me as suggesting *pomme* and the old North of England *pome*, an apple, which latter word, as a verb, also signifies in Cornwall to pummel with the fist. But *pommel* in Ang.-Norman meant anything globular. *Cob*, in early English a blow, and to-day amongst boys a concussion produced by the knee upon another part of the body, besides its probably obsolete use as a verb, to box the ear, once signified a stone, a kernel, a lump of anything. In the game called 'cob-nut,' the nut used for pitching is known as the *cob*. Compare *to butt* (with the head) with *button*, *but*, etc., in their several technical, local, or archaic uses. *Bolt*, a bud or ball, as in the English compound *ball-weed* for 'ball-weed,' may account for *bolled* in its sense of 'struck, buffeted,' in MS. Laud, cited in Halliwell's Dictionary, my authority for most of the above. *Bob*, Yorkshire for a ball, and local for the pear-shaped plummet at the end of a mason's line, means also a blow. *Bobby* is to strike, *bobbiden* may be its participle, as it signifies 'buffeted, struck,' and *bollet* is a buffet or stroke. Can you give me the etymology of the verb *to box*?”

And on the same subject another subscriber writes:

“In reply to your correspondent's question as to whether the names of fruits are used in other languages to express a blow on the head or face, I desire to say that among 'le peuple' in France the expression, 'Je le donne une mûre' (a mulberry), is in common use. They also say, 'un pain' (bread), which may come from bread-frait, and 'une beigne,' abbreviation of 'beignet,' which means an apple-fritter. They also use the expression, 'Je le donne une girofle à cinq feuilles,' the transition from fruits to flowers being quite natural. I give this information for whatever it may be worth, without being able to offer any explanation of the principle, unless it be that the inhabitants of warm countries living much in the open air are very apt to receive blows on the head from the falling dates, figs, etc., and hence the expression.”

We may remark that, according to Littré, *beignet* is a diminutive of *béigne*, *beugne* (Old Fr. *beigne*), signifying a 'tumor'; so that not the apple of the fritter but the swelling would appear to be the leading idea of the metaphor—the effect being put for the cause in the idiom referred to.

—When the *Alabama* dispute is revived by Congress, in all probability the advocates of the arbitrary right of the Government to distribute the fund received from England in any way it pleases will bring forward with an air of triumph a case recently decided by the court of Queen's Bench. In this case (*Rustomjee v. The Queen*, Law Rep. 1 Q. B. D. 487) the plaintiff, a Chinese merchant, had claims, with a number of other traders, against an insolvent Chinese company, which, by a treaty between the Queen and the Emperor of China, were assumed by the latter, who paid a sum to the British Government in liquidation of them. It was, like the *Alabama* fund, a "lump sum," and it was paid on the understanding that it was to be distributed among the claimants according to the principles of equity and justice. The plaintiff, for some reason which did not appear in the case, did not get what he thought to be his share, and after a lapse of many years brought his action against the Queen, on a "petition of right," to make her

pay over this claim. The theory on which his action proceeded was that the Queen had been his agent or trustee in the collection of the claim, and was responsible like a private person. The court holds this view out of the question, and lays it down that the notion that the sovereign of the country could be in such matters the agent or trustee of the private claimants in the legal sense of those terms is absurd. The treaty, they say, was a sovereign act, and although, of course, the Queen was bound on general principles to distribute the fund justly, her dealings with it could not be enquired into in a court of law. Now, this at first sight may seem to conflict with the view taken by large numbers of right-minded persons (including at one time Mr. Caleb Cushing, who afterwards, however, changed his opinion) to the effect that the United States is a trustee for the claimants of the *Alabama* fund. But there is no conflict in reality; the law of the English court is no doubt good law, and if any claimant on the *Alabama* fund undertook to bring an action against the United States, or against any person concerned in the negotiation of the treaty, they would find that they were entirely without remedy. The trusteeship and agency of the United States in the collection is not a legal relation. It is a relation in the forum of morals. It is morally, not legally, that the United States are bound to apply the money received from England to the payment of the claims, in accordance with the direction of the court of arbitration. We have no doubt, however, that General Butler has had his attention called to *Rustonjee v. The Queen*, and that some of his Congressional dupes will before many weeks be ringing the changes on it in the "halls of debate" at Washington, and pointing out to a disgusted world that Lord Cockburn himself has been rendering a decision in which he declares that a "petition of right" for money had and received, under a treaty of restitution, in a "lump sum," of the Emperor of China, will not lie against the Queen of England.

—The last number of the *Edinburgh Review* contains an article on the Declaration of Paris, which is of some interest as bearing on the discussion with regard to its proposed abrogation which is to be renewed in the next session of Parliament. The whole question seems, probably, to nine persons out of ten, as all questions of international law do, in which they are not directly interested, a purely abstract one; but its practical consequences, in the case of a European war, may be enormous, as one of the corollaries of the repeal of the Declaration would be the possibility of England, as a belligerent, covering the high seas with fleets of privateers. There is in England just now a strong undercurrent of feeling that, in agreeing to the celebrated principles announced in 1856, England surrendered valuable maritime belligerent rights, and an attempt has been made to show that the Declaration was an unauthorized engagement, which one of the English representatives afterwards declared he had no authority to enter into. The *Edinburgh* now brings forward some moral arguments on the other side which seem pretty strong. These are, in substance, that whatever may have been the technical authority of the commissioners in the premises, the Declaration contained a clause engaging the governments concerned "to bring the present Declaration to the knowledge of the states which have not taken part in the Congress of Paris, and invite them to accede to it." This was actually done, and for twenty years hardly a voice has been raised to question the validity of the obligation, and half a dozen wars have occurred in which England, as a neutral, has had the benefit of it. Under these circumstances, the *Edinburgh* maintains that England is just as much bound by the Declaration as if it had been ratified by every branch of the government. The article also undertakes to show that it is not for the interest of England to withdraw from the Declaration, any more than it is right for her to do so. The argument by which this position is supported seems to us rather weak, inasmuch as it consists in part of an assertion that the right to issue letters of marque is of no appreciable value to a belligerent:

"During the American Civil War the cruisers of the Confederate States inflicted great losses on the commerce of their adversary, from which it has not recovered to this day. But however inconvenient, and even disastrous, this predatory warfare might be, it did not retard by a single day the capture of Richmond; and it is admitted by M. de Gasparin, one of the warmest champions of the Northern States, that it produced no appreciable effect upon the results of the war. As a *defensive* measure it was wholly ineffectual."

The immediate effect produced by the Confederate cruisers was the transfer of American commerce to neutral flags, the increase of the rates of insurance, and consequent increase of war costs in every direction. Exactly how long the expensiveness of the war made it, or how much sooner we should have captured Richmond had there been no Confederate cruisers, it is of course impossible to say, but that the Confederacy found letters of marque an effective weapon of defence can hardly be questioned.

—Some of the English journals have recently contained accounts of the newly-found "treasures" of Kurium, in Cyprus. The *Athenaeum* for the fourth of November, the *Times* for the eighth, and the *Daily News* for the eleventh of the same month contain each a long paper on the subject, to which we refer readers for a fuller account than we can give of the objects found, the place they were found in, and the interesting researches which ended so successfully. Additional information has been received, indeed, from General Di Cesnola himself. But nothing so received has contradicted, in important points, the general history of the matter as given by the *Athenaeum*, for instance. For a really full account of the discovery, and, indeed, for a full description of any of the works of art discovered, we have to await the arrival of the collection in this country, the unpacking of the whole, and its arrangement in the new building of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in Central Park. It is a long time to wait, but we have at all events the satisfaction of knowing that the whole collection is secured for New York; that General Di Cesnola is to come himself to arrange it; that if some objects are to be sold they will be only those which the collection can well spare, and that the discoverer himself will undoubtedly be allowed to be the judge of the matter; finally, that we shall see the whole mass of the Cyprus discoveries together, except the very few pieces sold years ago, and that they will be kept together. The London journals we have named express natural regrets that the former collection of Cyprus antiquities came to America, and urge that in this country there is no chance of comparison with antiquities found elsewhere, and that European scholars have but little opportunity of modifying their theories or of adding to their knowledge by the examination of the Cypriote collection. Assuming, as they all assume, that the present Kurium treasure should be bought by the British Museum, there was every reason for such regret. Even an American archaeologist or art-student might have preferred to keep all the Cesnola discoveries together in one museum, and might have felt inclined to "pool" the whole and cast lots for its ownership. But the purchase of the whole by the Museum of our city alters the case. Who, of the scholars and art-lovers of Europe, can begrudge America one large and full museum of ancient art? Who can object even to the passage of the ocean, when the collection he comes to study is adequate? As the lover of Majolica or of Oriental porcelain dislikes to see a splendid vase adorning a private room which has nothing else akin to it, and longs to see it transferred to some ownership which would give it its natural illustration and support, so London may have objected to New York's possession of a few invaluable inscriptions—a few new types of design—some pottery of forms elsewhere unknown; and these without any proper sequence of other examples. But there was always the unequalled collection of Greek glass; that this should be in New York might be a cause of lamentation to the London student, but could not well be grudged Americans. And now, if we are to have an important display of archaic gold and even silver vessels, jewelry, and engraved gems, carvings in rock-crystal mounted in gold, specimens of very early repoussé work, and chasing in the precious metals and in bronze, all found together, and all perfect except the silver, and even the silver more perfect than ever before was known in such ancient works of art, certainly we shall have so much that we may be allowed to keep it, if not unenvied, at least not unapproved.

—There are several points in which these discoveries are seen to be especially important, even from afar. Thus, the *Athenaeum* promises to students of ancient Glyptic art much new light on engraved gems, their history and significance. And, without knowing what the writer we quote had in mind, it is evident that a number of intagli found together, all of very high antiquity and known to be so, all found so far away from Italy that they can hardly be supposed to have felt Italian influences, are sure to contain about the most important addition possible to the existing materials for the history of gem-engraving. Some confusion between Etruscan and Greek design still exists, and this because most previously known archaic Greek gems have been found in Italy; the stones found in Cyprus ought to clear up those doubts, at least in part. Then the mysterious "origin of Greek art," and its connection with the art of Egypt and, more doubtfully, with that of Assyria—all these matters, which only need a very little light thrown upon them to be among the most interesting subjects of enquiry, are confessedly within the sphere of the Cesnola discoveries, old and new. As for inscriptions, the new collection would seem to be rich in them, and all the Cesnola inscriptions hitherto have been of especial value, except a few late Greek ones, quite accidentally brought into the collection—surface discoveries, so to speak. The objects of art found in tombs and in the newly-discovered temple treasury at Kurium, are made the more interesting and instructive by the places in which they were found. General Di Cesnola is now living in London, engaged upon a work on

Cyprus. We hope to find in that book the most positive and minute description of the tombs of all sorts and of different epochs and nationalities, from Phœnician to Greek, together with such diagrams as may make descriptions clear. The position of the bodies found upon their permanent biers, the disposition within the sepulchral chambers of those biers, the arrangement of vases, figures, glass vessels, and jewelry, with relation to the bodies—all this needs full description, and we confidently hope that the discoverer will give it us. As to the underground treasury which the Kurium priests seem to have left in such a hurry one day so long ago, leaving behind them no tradition of its existence so clear as to lead treasure-seekers to its discovery, that repository certainly should be minutely described and figured.

—Mr. Christern sends us two French works having a Centennial tincture. One is Léon Chotteau's *'Les Français en Amérique,'* to which M. Laboulaye contributes a clever preface with the usual, we might almost say the required, "little dig" at the German conquerors of his country. He commends the book to Frenchmen intending to visit the Philadelphia Exhibition, and in fact M. Chotteau, as if with an eye to being serviceable in that direction, devotes some space to statistics of the progress of the United States. For his general summary of the causes of the Revolution and the state of affairs when France appeared openly on the scene he relies upon M. Laboulaye's own historical writings, while for many particulars concerning "the French in America" he acknowledges his further indebtedness to Mr. Balch of Philadelphia, who has published the first volume of a work having the same title as M. Chotteau's, as our readers may remember. M. Chotteau's style suffers by comparison with that of his patron, being fatiguingly jerky and declamatory. He is, it appears from his publisher's announcement, engaged upon another work, *'Les Hommes d'Amérique,'* in which Lincoln, Davis, Andrew Johnson, Seward, Thaddeus Stevens, Dix, Grant, Colfax, E. B. Washburne, and Greeley—the leaders in the civil war and in reconstruction—will give variety to a single volume. A much better and soberer production than the first named is M. Alphonse Jonault's *'George Washington.'* The author visited this country in 1861, and describes pleasantly in his introduction a pilgrimage which he made to Mount Vernon and Independence Hall. He has, as a result of consulting the standard authorities, fallen into error in regard to the Washington pedigree, for in a very ragged way he endeavors to trace a connection as far back as 1538. But this is quite pardonable, and is lost sight of in the solid merits of the intelligent, unpretentious narrative which follows.

WILLERT'S LOUIS XI.*

THE career of Louis XI. presents a curious problem. How could a ruler whose morality fell below that of Jonathan Wild yet achieve some of the greatest permanent results of patriotic statesmanship, and be esteemed not only by himself but by so calm an observer as Commynes the model of kingly virtue? As to Louis's moral character and principles, or want of principle, not a doubt can be entertained. To say he committed the acts of a villain is to fall far short of the truth. He not only did evil but avowedly acted on principles which sap all morality. "He declared himself," writes Mr. Willert, "the disciple of Francis Sforza and one of the first acts of his reign was to send secretly for two Venetian nobles, who were to initiate him into the policy of that astute and despotic aristocracy." He sorely needed the teaching of such instructors. He certainly did not neglect their worst maxims. His foes were perfidious, and he met their treachery by more profound craft. It was his habit to make promises which he never meant to fulfil. Allies had no more ground to trust him than foes. He was bound by every tie of honor to the citizens of Liège, yet he betrayed them to their foe, and himself took part in the slaughter of his friends and dupes. He was not, it is said, needlessly cruel—that is to say, he was not one of those monsters who actually enjoy the sight of suffering—but he was absolutely indifferent to the infliction of pain. In his very residence he imprisoned his enemies in cages. He was indignant with the Parliament of Paris for not torturing St. Pol before his execution. Popular rumor attributed to him, especially towards the close of his life, cruelties such as are reported of the worst of tyrants. "The king," it was said, "drank, by the advice of his doctors, the blood of young children. The peasants who were compelled to pass near the towers of Plessis were affrighted by the groans of prisoners dying on the rack, and fishermen who cast their nets into the river drew to land sacks in which the victims of the king's suspicion had been drowned." In the total destruction of Arras he

anticipated the treatment of Lyons by the most cruel of the Terrorists, and, if he is well described as being in some sense a revolutionist, he had certainly all the cold cruelty of a Jacobin. Let it be granted that he did not actually murder his brother, it must still be remembered that no one thought him incapable of the crime, and we may feel sure that Louis himself would have held fratricide, if necessary to his ends, an allowable act of statesmanship.

Nor can it be said that his cruelty sprang from religious fanaticism. He possessed a kind of religious belief, but it was a species of religion which a respectable heathen would have scorned. He attempted to bribe heaven, or rather the saints, just as he attempted to win over his Swiss allies—that is, by gifts of money. A superstitious respect for a particular form of oath, a belief that the gift of silver or golden images would propitiate the Virgin, made up the whole of his genuine creed. Yet this man, who was daunted by no cruelty and who could be bound by no oath save one, did work which all statesmen must admire, and which French patriots must fervently approve. He was the creator of modern France. When he came to the throne it seemed more than likely that an utterly selfish and treacherous nobility would tear the country in pieces. The English still threatened to repeat the horrors of their invasions. The House of Burgundy overbalanced the power of the crown, and stimulated lawlessness throughout the whole country. The peasantry were miserably oppressed, and the middle classes could not prosper for want of that rule of law which is the first requisite for civilization. When Louis died, the existence of France and the power of the French crown was secured: "He had extended the frontiers of his kingdom; Picardy, Provence, Burgundy, Anjou, Maine, Roussillon had been compelled to acknowledge the immediate authority of the crown." He had crushed the feudal oligarchy; he had seen his most dangerous enemy destroyed by the resistance of the Swiss; he had baffled the attempt to construct a state which would have imperilled the national existence of France; he had put an end to all risk of English invasion; and he left France the most powerful country in Europe. Her internal government was no doubt oppressive, but, at any rate, it secured the rule of law; and his schemes for her benefit were still unfinished. He died regretting that he could not carry out his plans for the reform of the law and for the protection of commerce; and, in the opinion of Commynes, if God had granted him the grace of living five or six years more, he would greatly have benefited his realm. He died commending his soul to the intercession of the Virgin, and the last words caught from his lips were: "Lord, in thee have I trusted; let me never be confounded." Nor should this be taken as the expression of hopeless self-delusion or gratuitous hypocrisy. In the opinion of Commynes, uttered after the king's death, "he was more wise, more liberal, and more virtuous in all things than any contemporary sovereign."

The expressions of Commynes were, it may be said, but the echo of the low moral tone of the age. This, no doubt, is true; but the fact that the age did not condemn acts which, taken alone, seem to argue the utmost depravity, still needs explanation. The matter is the more worthy of consideration because Louis represents, though in an exaggerated form, the vices and virtues of a special body of rulers. He was the incarnation, so to speak, of kingcraft. The word and the idea it represents have now become out of date, but for about two centuries—say, roughly, from the middle of the fifteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century—the idea of a great king was that of a monarch who ruled by means of cunning, intrigue, and disregard of ordinary moral rules. We here come across the fact which explains both the career and the reputation of Louis and of others, such as Henry VII. of England, who were masters of kingcraft. The universal feeling of the time, shared by subjects no less than by rulers, was that a king was not bound by the rules of morality, and especially by the rules of honesty, which bind other men. Until you realize this fact, nothing is more incomprehensible than the adulation lavished by men such as Bacon or Casaubon on a ruler such as James I. When once the feeling is understood, it is easy to see how rulers who, in modern judgment, seem to merit nothing but hatred and condemnation, might receive the worship and flattery of men far greater and better than themselves.

The real puzzle is to ascertain how this feeling that kings were above the moral law came into existence. The facts of history afford the necessary explanation. When the modern European world was falling into shape the one thing required for national prosperity was the growth of a power which might check the disorders of the feudal nobility, and secure for the mass of the people the blessings of an orderly government. The only power which, in most cases, could achieve this end, was the crown. In England the monarchs put an end to the wars of the nobility. In France the growth of

* *'The Reign of Louis XI.'* By P. F. Willert, M. A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. London: Rivingtons. 876.

the monarch secured not only internal quiet, but protection from external invasion. In these and in other cases the interest of the crown and the interest of the people became for a time identical. Two results followed. The sentiment which in modern times has become a feeling of loyalty to the laws or to the constitution became in the fifteenth century a sentiment of loyalty to the crown. The feeling, as is constantly the case, survived its justification. Englishmen could not realize that a king was but a man till Charles I. died on the scaffold, and the fervor of French loyalty was extinguished only by the weakness and vices of Louis XV. Kings themselves shared and exaggerated the sentiment of their subjects. To promote the royal power seemed the dictate as much of patriotism as of ambition. Acts which would have seemed villainous when done to promote a purely private interest, became mere devices of statesmanship when performed in the interest of the public. The maxims that the king can do no wrong, and that the safety of the people is the highest law, blended together in the minds of ambitious rulers. The result was the production of men like Louis XI, who, with a real regard for the interest of the state, hesitated at no crime because they in good faith believed that all acts were pardonable which promoted regal power.

GOBINEAU'S 'NOUVELLES ASIATIQUES.'*

WE noticed in these columns a couple of years since M. de Gobineau's remarkable novel of 'Les Pléiades'—a work by no means formed to achieve popularity, but destined to awaken a peculiar degree, and, indeed, a peculiar quality, of interest, in the minds of a few readers. Such readers will be certain to give speedy attention to a new work of imagination from the same hand, and we think we can assure them that the volume of 'Nouvelles Asiatiques' now before us will not disappoint their just expectations. It is not too much to say of M. de Gobineau that he is a fascinating writer. His merit is not the usual French merit of form; he does not present that hard, smooth surface, as flawless as that of the delicate white porcelain manufactured in France and known as *biscuit*—as flawless and about as individual—which is offered us by the usual French story-teller; his charm is much more that of substance. He is a man of thought, of deep observation, of a taste for general truths, and he is intellectually less after the French pattern than any Frenchman of his day. To Oriental studies M. de Gobineau has devoted much of his life, and his excellent work entitled 'Les Religions de l'Asie' is probably much better known than any of his attempts in the line of fiction are likely to be. In this collection of tales he sums up some of his personal impressions of the Oriental character. He is evidently deeply versed in Asiatic manners; he has lived in the midst of them. In fact, although M. de Gobineau is at present French Minister to Sweden, he formerly occupied more than one diplomatic post in the East. He pays, in an interesting introduction to his volume, a compliment to an English book which was much read forty years ago, but is now almost wholly forgotten. Morier's novel of 'Hajji-Baba'—the novel-readers of the first half of this century will remember it—is, according to M. de Gobineau, "assuredly the best book that has been written upon the temperament of an Asiatic nation." "It is a matter of course," he immediately adds, "that the 'Arabian Nights' are here counted out; they remain incomparable, they are the truth itself, and they will never be equalled. But this masterpiece excepted, 'Hajji-Baba' holds the first rank. . . . What it depicts is the levity, the inconsistency of mind, the tenuity of moral ideas among the Persians." We may ask in parenthesis whether now—in the days of 'Daniel Deronda,' that is—that fiction and "culture" are, like the lion and the lamb, lying down together, and the contemplation of race-questions is very much the fashion, it would not be worth some publisher's trouble to reprint Morier's charming tale? It was reprinted in the far away days when English fiction reached us almost exclusively by way of Philadelphia; but the Philadelphia pamphlet, happily for modern eyesight, will not be easy to find.

"It has not only been my design," says M. de Gobineau, "to bring out, after Morier, the more or less conscious immorality of the Asiatics, and the spirit of lies which governs them; I have tried that too, but that was not enough. It seemed to me to the purpose not to leave in the shade the bravery of some and the sincerely romantic temper of others; the native goodness of these, the fundamental honesty of those; among certain ones the passion of patriotism pushed to its last excesses; among certain others complete generosity, devotion, affection; among all an incomparable *laissez aller* and the absolute tyranny of the first impulse, whether it be good or whether it be the worst possible."

The author has endeavored to be as characteristic as possible, and to select types and cases which shall be intensely illustrative.

The local color of the East in its material sense has probably been overdone during the last thirty years. What M. de Gobineau has tried to reproduce is the local color of the Oriental mind and soul. He is a very acute psychologist, and he handles the subtle threads of the Eastern character with singularly unerring fingers. He puts himself as far as possible into the Asiatic skin, looks at things from his heroes' and heroines' point of view, never comments nor protests, but contents himself with relating exactly how his characters felt and acted in the circumstances which he has devised for them. His tales are six in number, and they are perhaps of unequal merit; two, at least, of which the scene is laid in Persia—'The Story of Gamber-Ali' and 'The War of the Turcomans'—are genuine masterpieces. 'The Dancing-Girl of Shamakha' is a story of the Russian Caucasus, and is a very curious and touching study of the female character in regions where the aspirations of the softer sex have not that elevated tone which they have attained among ourselves. The figure of Omm-Dj'hane is indeed an admirable portrait of a formidable but doubtless very possible original. The word "Tartar" has passed into English speech with a very invidious meaning, which, it must be confessed, is completely justified by M. de Gobineau's vivid representation of a passionate Tartar maiden. And, in speaking of this tale, we may note the singular fact that M. Gobineau, when he has occasion to introduce a European hero, never selects one of his own countrymen. In 'Les Pléiades' the two heroes were English and German; the heroines were English, German, and Russian. In 'La Danseuse de Shamakha' the interesting young European whom he makes the object of the hopeless passion of his fascinating Calmuck is a Spaniard; and in the last tale in the book, the 'Vie de Voyage,' desiring to represent the emotions of a civilized young couple who undertake to travel in an immense caravan, he selects two Italians. It may almost be said that with M. de Gobineau any reference to his native land is conspicuous by its absence. This, however, is a detail. The second story, 'L'illustre Magicien,' is perhaps the least interesting, though it doubtless touches a very characteristic point, being the history of a most exemplary and amiable young Persian, married to a wife in every way worthy of him, and enjoying the fullest domestic bliss and prosperity, who leaves his happy home to follow a squalid Dervish and learn the great secret of truth.

'Gamber-Ali,' as we have said, is admirable, and, as a sympathetic and irresponsible picture of unconscious rascality, is hardly inferior to one of Browning's dramatic monologues. (It should be noted that the author always tells his story exactly as a fellow-townsmen of his hero would tell it—with the same moral tone.) Gamber-Ali is a young man about town at Shiraz, remarkable for his personal beauty and his love of amusement, whose entrance into active life the author relates in detail. The details are taken, as the French say, *sur le vif*, and afford an interesting picture of the state of manners and morals in the land of Firdousi and of the jeweled monarch whom the kingdoms of Europe outstrove each other three years since to entertain. Gamber-Ali is the child of epicurean parents, and the Bohemian ménage of the shiftless painter Hassan-Kahn and his terrible wife, Bibi Djanem, is very happily touched off. Their dissipated son, in a drunken scrimmage in a tavern, has the good fortune to pass for having diverted a few blows from the portly person of one of the hangers-on of the palace of the governor, and the gratitude of this flurried functionary proves the stepping-stone of the young man's fortunes. He becomes a sort of Persian Gil Blas, obtains a place in the governor's suite, learns all the tricks of the trade, lies and steals triumphantly, and lines his pocket with the bribes of all applicants for justice or favor. But his avidity proves his ruin, or nearly so, inasmuch as he fails to share his booty with his employers, to whom, properly, a handsome percentage of all profits is due. This brings him into contempt and disgrace, and finally, having stabbed to death one of his fellow-servants, he is obliged to flee for his life, and takes refuge in a mosque erected over the tomb of an eminent saint. The account of his sojourn in this inviolable asylum is the best part of the story. He is represented as being in an insurmountable agony of fear as to what will be done to him if he is taken, and the picture of his frank, expansive, absorbing terror completes admirably the whole portrait of his smoothness, softness, impudence, luxuriousness, and, as it were, feminine rascality. The most solemn assurances that he will be allowed to escape in safety cannot induce him to budge. He becomes an object of extreme interest to all the faithful who frequent the mosque, and who cover him with admiration and sympathy. The ladies of the locality "go on" about him as if he were a handsome tenor or light comedian in New York, and a perpetual chorus of feminine lamentation and adulation surrounds his resting-place. At last the King of Kings, in person, comes to visit the mosque, and the terror of

* 'Nouvelles Asiatiques.' Par le Comte de Gobineau. Paris: Didier & Co.; New York: F. W. Christern. 1876.

Gamber-Ali, lest the mighty monarch should detach him by force from his refuge, becomes such that he clings to the walls of the monument (the tomb of the saint) as a drowning man to a spar. He is pointed out to the king, who condescends to converse with him, tries to persuade him that he may go in peace, and finally gives his royal word that not a hair of his head shall be touched. But Gamber-Ali, stupid with terror, only clings the closer and trembles the harder, and the monarch marches off in disgust. Then the chorus of admiration from the ladies deepens, and the young refugee is almost mobbed by the fair spectators. At last the sentiment of the assemblage finds expression in the energetic conduct of a great lady, who makes her way into the sacred enclosure and fairly kidnaps Gamber-Ali, now too exhausted with inanition to resist, having been afraid to touch the cakes and sweetmeats offered him by his admirers lest they should poison him. The lady in question carries him off in her coach-and-four, comforts and consoles him, and makes him her chief steward; in which character he may now be seen riding about in state, more beautiful than ever, supremely happy, covered with jewels, and adored by all observers.

'La Guerre des Turcomans' is a picture of Persian optimism, or, at least, of the amiable serenity with which persons of that enviable race may endure the most odious tribulations. Ghoulam-Hussain relates his own adventures, and his tone is a wonderful mixture of patience and humility in the individual, and complacency and impudence in the race. There is an extraordinary air of truth in his wife's repeated experiments in matrimony—for in offering facilities for such experiments Persia appears almost to compete with certain sections of our own country—and in his easily-accepted miseries and easily-enjoyed mitigations during his life in the army and his captivity by the foe. 'Les Amants de Kandahar' is striking, but it is more romantic, less ironical, and less entertaining than its companions. 'La Vie de Voyage' is hardly a tale; it is a sketch of homesickness, of what a young European woman feels when she is launched in a great caravan with a two months' journey before her; of the oppressive strangeness and isolation, amounting almost to terror, which finally forces her to persuade her husband to retreat in the first caravan they encounter bound for Europe. We had marked for quotation from these pages an admirable description of the aspect, march, and movement of a great promiscuous caravan, but we have exceeded our space. All M. de Gobineau's pages, moreover, are worth reading; they are the work of a rich and serious mind, of a really philosophic observer.

Children's Holiday Books.—'The Boy Emigrants' (Scribner, Armstrong & Co.) and 'The Young Trail Hunters' (Lee & Shepard) are addressed to boys of twelve and upwards, and further resemble each other in describing overland journeys to California. Mr. Brooks takes his young gold-hunters by the northern route, with no Indian adventures to speak of; Mr. Cozzens and his youngsters follow the southern trail, and their advance is constantly disputed by Apaches and Comanches, with whom they have several bloody encounters. Both writers have, in the pursuit of local color, introduced the *soi-disant* friendly Indian, who bears a written "character" which he confidently exhibits to new acquaintances. In the case of Mr. Brooks's Pawnee it ran thus:

"This Indian, Mekonce, otherwise known as The-Man-that-Champs-with-his-Teeth, wants a recommendation. I give it with pleasure. He is a lying, thieving Pawnee. He will steal the tires off of your wagon-wheels and the buttons from your trousers. Watch him.—(Signed) JAKE DAWSON, and thirteen others of the Franklin Grove Company."

Of the same tenor, but terser, is the one recorded by Mr. Cozzens:

"the Bearer, Cuchillo, is a Comanche Chief, who says he is a friend of the White's. My advice is not to Trust him, or any other sneakin' varmint like him.—BILL POPE."

Both these stories strike us as written in good faith by men experienced in what they describe. 'The Boy Emigrants' is the better told of the two, and the better illustrated. Both are entertaining and both may be pronounced unobjectionable, while a choice may still be thought to lie between the contemplation of savage atrocity and of mining brutality and lawlessness. The picture, we ought to add, is carefully underdrawn by both writers.

In like manner we couple for convenience' sake 'The House with Spectacles' (Putnam's) and 'Roddy's Ideal' (same publishers). The class to which they belong is one we have often had occasion to characterize as pseudo-juvenile. Their smartness is of a kind not useful to young readers, and which, whether consciously or not, seeks the applause of their elders. This is curiously manifest in 'Roddy's Ideal.' Mrs. Johnson begins by confessing: "I've made one story which our children can't read because

there's so much of me in it; Roddy [her husband] has made one they can't read because there's so much of him in it; now for the *three*, and away goes she!—the successful jump." This is Chapter I; Chapters II.-IV. are still addressed to adult readers, and with Chapter V. the author gets down, or thinks she gets down, to the infant level. Children not her own can doubtless read and enjoy this story. It is bright, humorous, and full of incident, and it has a moral purpose. For all that, we do not feel that Mrs. Johnson writes with an eye single to her little audience, or that we can congratulate her on the success with which she has kept herself out of the story. Fun and mischief-making give zest to 'The House with Spectacles.' In it eight children "educate each other," and this is not surprising considering what weak parents they have. We shall cite but two passages from this singular school record to show, on the one hand, for whom its smartness is intended, and, on the other, how much the reading of it is likely to profit the young. The children get up a mock revival and with so much success that two colored "aunties," overhearing, take part in earnest till the spell is broken by the mimic's shying a Bible at the head of an obstinate sinner. He is made to apologize afterwards, and to say that he does respect religion and is trying to be a Christian, and that "throwing the Bible was worst of all." Another of their pranks is to dye black the hair of a brother, so that when, in the next morning's lesson, "Thou canst not turn one hair white or black" is read, a titter suggests the conflict between science and Scripture. This is amusing, perhaps, and may not be harmful, but it stamps the story as a holiday squib which only awaits its turn to be permanently eclipsed.

'The Boys and Girls of the Revolution' (Lippincott) is a timely book, and indeed one that would be acceptable at any time. It consists of stories gathered, it is said, from a great variety of sources, such as newspapers, old journals, diaries, and letters. Most of them are, so far as we know, new, and they are certainly a welcome contribution to our Centennial literature. There is considerable inequality in the working up; all are graphic and interesting, but some run overmuch into sentiment and what is called "newspaper English," such as "glorious nobleness of this night's deeds." Again, the term "Boys and Girls" is made to include young men and women. These are slight faults, however, and the book as a whole deserves to be popular. One of the very best and truest to the title is "The Little Black-eyed Rebel."

The fairy-tales of the Misses Kavanagh ('The Pearl Fountain, etc.,' Henry Holt & Co.) are mild without being flat, and of a pleasant ingenuity. We recommend them as soothing to palates excited by (say) Mr. Knatchbull-Hugessen's purveying. There is a careful exclusion of what is raw and bloody, and the morals are delicately pointed. The volume is conspicuous among the publications of the season for its typographical elegance.

In Mrs. Sandford's 'Houseful of Children' (E. P. Dutton & Co.) the number of *dramatis personæ* suddenly brought upon the stage is appalling. The story labors under the difficulty of having apparently been written to fit a series of pictures having no relation to each other. The effect on the infant mind, we should think, would be somewhat bewildering. In themselves the illustrations are of all degrees of excellence, the paper and print of the highest, and the binding very pretty.

The Complete American Trapper: or, the Tricks of Trapping and Trap-making. By Wm. Gibson. (New York: James Miller, 1876.)—This book is written, as the preface states, "to fill an odd and neglected corner in American literature," and to instruct in topics which are "of the utmost interest to boys of this country." It contains full directions for making all varieties of traps and snares, both great and small, and, although it is sometimes rather obscure, the diversity and extent of its information are quite remarkable. From a humming-bird to a grizzly bear there is no member of our fauna whose destruction is not explained. The book is thoroughly and generally well illustrated, and in its short descriptions of different animals and their habits is not without merit. Mr. Gibson has omitted no kind of trap in his catalogue, although some that he mentions are, we should think, quite as remarkable for their cruelty as their effectiveness; for instance, on page 95 there are an illustration and description of the "hook trap," by which wild ducks are taken on baited fish-hooks. The book shows a very wide familiarity with illegal methods of capturing game, and, except in the portions of it devoted to the taking of vermin and some of the fur-bearing animals, is calculated to point out to its readers a number of short roads to the penitentiary wherever any game laws are enforced. The "pot-hunting" and unsportsmanlike feeling that is fostered in boys by teaching them, for instance, to construct a trap which will take every grouse or quail in a piece of woods, instead of the manly way of pursuing them with dog and gun, is not at all desirable. It is by the un-

lawful use of many of Mr. Gibson's devices and kindred ones that some of our most valuable kinds of game have been nearly exterminated; and until boys are old enough to pursue wild fowls and beasts in a humane and manly way, their venatorial impulses should be checked rather than encouraged. We cannot recommend the book, as almost its sole value is in what it contains of natural history, and its objectionable features more than neutralize this good one.

A Vocabulary of English Rhymes. Arranged on a new plan by Rev. Samuel W. Barnum. (New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1876. 16mo, pp. xviii, 767.)—The Poet at the Breakfast table declares that he had no need of a dictionary of rhymes: "When a word comes up fit to end a line with, I can find all the rhymes in the language that are fit to go with it without naming them. I have tried them all so many times, I know all the polygamous words and all the monogamous ones, and all the unmarried ones—the whole lot that have no mates—as soon as I hear their names called." Other less practised versifiers, however, and less poetic it may be, will find in a volume like this aid for their ailing muse. Nor is its usefulness confined to assistance in the piecing out of couplets and the consequent increase in the quantity of machine-made verse, a result of more than doubtful utility; if properly prepared it is of value also as a record of contemporary pronunciation, and as a reference book for phonetic investigation. In these secondary objects Mr. Barnum seems to us to be more successful than in his primary aim. He has arranged the rhymes in alphabetical order: each sound of each vowel is taken in turn, the phonetic notation used being that of the later editions of Webster's Dictionary, with which the compiler has been connected. Thus we have the rhymes to the vowel sound *a* as in *mate*, first singly and then in conjunction with other letters, *ah*, *ahs*, etc., followed by the rhymes to the vowel sound of *a* as in *mat*, with its combinations *ah*, *ahs*, etc. This arrangement is logical and exact, and if well carried out—as it is here—there is much to be said in its favor, though it hardly seems as convenient for the rhyme-seeker as the less cumbersome plan of simply arranging together terminations of similar sound and spelling, with cross-references to other terminations of the same sound and different spelling. Thus, for instance, under *ay* as in *bray*, we should have besides *bray*, *day*, and so forth, references to *ey*, *digh*, *ch*, and the French *é*. Under Mr. Barnum's arrangement if *weigh* is the word which the poet wishes to mate, he must at once remember that its vowel sound is arbitrarily represented as *ē*, which he will find on p. 1; but if *hurra* is the word for which he seeks a rhyme, then he has to turn to *ā*, on p. 29. In short, he must have the system at his fingers' ends.

A dictionary of rhymes on what we may term the cross-reference plan is contained in the late Tom Hood's "Rules of Rhyme," a little volume with which Mr. Barnum is seemingly unacquainted. Mr. Barnum's one hundred and seventy pages of single rhymes contain a few more polysyllabic words, and are, therefore, more useful; but they seem to us to have been at times unduly extended by the repetition of words which happen also to be proper names, for instance *may* and *May*, and especially by the lavish insertion of French words and phrases. Of two hundred and forty-three rhymes in *ā*, seventy-two are foreign, *mā*, *deblā*, *bīdēt*, *au fait*, etc., besides nine like *croquet* and *bouquet*, originally French, but whose naturalization may fairly be allowed now. Mr. Barnum's object in making these insertions was, we surmise, to secure accuracy of pronunciation, but he has not always succeeded. Under *ā*, for example, along with *baa*, *papa*, and *hurra*, we find *song froit*, *oetroi*, and *tournois*. Here, either the compiler has not caught the exact pronunciation of the French, or—as a paragraph on p. xvi. also leads us to believe—he gives in to the heresy of "allowable" rhymes. Fortunately, Mr. Barnum has few such vagaries as this mispronunciation of the French; yet we detect a few: he joins, for instance, *women* and *personum* (p. 436), and *melon* and *philhellene* (p. 360).

Besides the one hundred and seventy pages of single rhymes, there are a page and a half of quintuple rhymes, twenty-one pages of quadruple, one hundred and thirty-four of treble, and four hundred and forty of double rhymes. This collection of female rhymes is the most valuable and the best part of the book. It is, of course, incomplete, for it is impossible to give all the double rhymes; any given male rhyme will make half-a-dozen female. Yet it is well that the boundless plain should be explored as far as may be, if only to show us how hopeless is the attempt to map the whole. *Chimney*, for instance, seems—to return to Dr. Holmes's figure—to be a predestined old maid, and is in fact not mentioned by Mr. Barnum, but the Smiths, although their addresses were rejected, bound it fast in *cinculo matrimonii* to *slim loam*. *Seeds in mirth* was a confirmed bachelor until Dr. Donaldson of Cambridge published the lines in a quatrain:

"Youths who would senior wranglers be
Must drink the juice distilled from tea;
Must burn the midnight oil from month to month,
Raising binomials to the n-1th."

Verrazano is a motion for the stay of judgment. (New York. 1876.)—In a former number we expressed our belief that the Verrazano controversy was not yet ended. An article in the *American Church Review* for July and the pamphlet before us show that we were not mistaken. In Mr. De Costa Mr. Murphy has met a keen, industrious, and practised critic. And we are glad of it, for there are still archives to search, documents to compare, statements to verify or impugn. If Verrazano was a bold and skilful navigator of unknown seas, give him his place by the side of Columbus and the Cabots; if a mere corsair, what is it to history if he died worthily by the garrote? In his pamphlet, Mr. De Costa asks for a stay of judgment and gives his reason for it. "As a general observation," he says, "it might be noted that the work is based chiefly on two assumptions, namely, that the letter of Verrazano, printed in 1556, giving an account of the voyage, was drawn from a document known as the 'Carli letter,' and that the letter of Verrazano was unknown in the lifetime of Francis I. We repeat deliberately that these are assumptions. And upon this foundation the whole superstructure of doubt has been reared." Verrazano's letter fails to mention wampum or the bark canoe, both of which he would have been sure to mention if he had seen them. Now, if he had made the voyage which he professes to have made, he would have seen wampum, the Indian's jewelry and money, and, having seen it, would have said something about it. But Verrazano is not the only explorer in Indian lands who passes over wampum. Many among them make omissions of equal importance. Some say nothing about tobacco; some give no list of Indian words. If any of these omissions is of itself sufficient to prove forgery or interpolation, more than one traveller will have to be looked closely to. But the most remarkable of Verrazano's omissions, according to Mr. Murphy, is that of the bark canoe; a boat of so peculiar a structure that it must have attracted the attention of any traveller, and more especially that of every sailor. The log canoe he does mention, and tells how it was made. "The natives made their canoes from the trunks of trees, which they burned out and shaped into boats. And in this respect Verrazano is perfectly correct." The birch canoe was a very different boat. The whole subject was investigated by another celebrated voyager, Lescaurbot, in 1607, and on the spot. He tells us "that while bark canoes were made in Massachusetts and Maine, the prevailing type was the log canoe." To make the birch canoe required sharp iron tools. "It is probable that in 1524 the birch canoe was not known at all, as it was difficult to make before the introduction of iron tools by Europeans, and was confined to northern parts, where the trees were generally small and scarce, which rendered canoes of bark and skin necessary, no matter what might be the cost. Farther south, in Maine and Massachusetts, where the timber was larger, fire would build the canoe, and this easy but slow style of naval construction prevailed until the white man came with sharp knives and hatchets. Then the tedious process of burning gradually went out of use, since with sharp tools a canoe could be made from bark in a day. Here Mr. Murphy's reasoning fails. Verrazano's failure to speak of the bark canoe in his narrative is one of the proofs of its authenticity."

Without going any further in the present state of the controversy we grant Mr. De Costa his stay of judgment.

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Authors.—Titles.

Publishers.—Prices.

Anderson (Prof. R. B.), Viking Tales of the North.....	(S. C. Griggs & Co.)	2 00
Birka (Prof. R. T.), Modern Physical Fatalism.....	(Macmillan & Co.)	2 25
Carrington (Col. H. B.), Battles of the American Revolution.....	(A. S. Barnes & Co.)	6 00
Curtis (R. R.), Doings Round the Circle.....	(J. R. Osgood & Co.)	2 50
Davies (Rev. F. M.), Mystic London.....	(Lovell, Adam, Wesson & Co.)	2 00
Dunlaway (Abigail), David and Anna Watson: a Poem.....	(S. R. Wells & Co.)	2 00
Elmendorf (Prof. J. J.), Lectures on the History of Philosophy.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 50
Fisher (W. M.), The Californians.....	(Macmillan & Co.)	2 00
Frothingham (Rev. O. B.), Chl d's Book of Religion, New ed.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 00
Garratton (Dr. J. E.), Hours with John Darby.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	2 00
Graff (J. F.), "Graveyard's" (ay Sermons.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	2 00
Hale (Rev. E. E.), Philip Nolan's Friends.....	(Seribner, Armstrong & Co.)	1 75
Holland (J. G.), The Mistress of the Manor.....	(Seribner, Armstrong & Co.)	5 00
Hooper (W. H.) and Phillips (W. C.), Manual of Marks on Pottery and Porcelain.....	(Macmillan & Co.)	1 75
Joan of Arc: a Poem.....	(Kerby & Fendler)	1 75
Johnson (Mrs. H. K.), Roddy's Ideal.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 25
Knox (W.), Oh, Why should the Spirit of Mortal be Proud?.....	(Lee & Shepard)	2 00
Kavanagh (Bridget and Julia), The Pearl Fountain, and Other Fairy Tales.....	(Henry Holt & Co.)	3 50
Lanier (S.), Poems.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	1 50
Leland (C. G.), Johnnykin and the Goblins.....	(Macmillan & Co.)	1 25
Long (G.), Meditations of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus.....	(Lee & Shepard)	1 25
Nartineau (Rev. J.), Modern Materialism.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 75
Parry (G.), An Alphabet in Finance.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 25
Stiner (E.), Sunshine in the Shady Place: a Tale.....	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	1 25
Mosenthal (J. de) and Harting (J. E.), Ostriches and Ostrich Farming.....	(Fribner & Co.)	1 25
Paekard (A. S., Jr.), Monograph on the Geometrid Moths.....	(Washington)	1 25
Palmer (E. H.), Concise Dictionary of the Persian Language.....	(Fribner & Co.)	1 25
Plato (E.), Glimpses inside the London Stock Exchange.....	(Lovell, Adam, Wesson & Co.)	1 00
Porter (W.), for November, and.....	(J. W. Bouton)	1 00
Purdy (W.), London Banking Life.....	(Lovell, Adam, Wesson & Co.)	1 25
Robinson (Leora P.), The House with Spectacles.....	(G. P. Putnam's Sons)	1 25

